



1958

Opinions About the Priesthood in Catholic High School Boys and Minor Seminarians

David DeSales Markert

Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Markert, David DeSales, "Opinions About the Priesthood in Catholic High School Boys and Minor Seminarians" (1958). *Dissertations*. Paper 705.

http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/705

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

Copyright © 1958 David DeSales Markert

OPINIONS ABOUT THE PRIESTHOOD IN CATHOLIC
HIGH SCHOOL BOYS AND MINOR SEMINARIANS

by

David DeSales Markert

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

June

1963

LIFE

On July 8, 1932 David DeSales Markert was born in St. Paul, Minnesota.

After graduating in 1950 from St. Thomas Military Academy in St. Paul, he attended the College of St. Thomas for three years. He continued his studies at Loyola University of Chicago in September, 1953 and obtained his Bachelor of Science degree from there in June, 1954.

The author began his graduate studies in psychology at Loyola during the summer of 1954. From 1954 to 1956 he worked as a graduate assistant in the department of psychology while pursuing his studies. In June of 1956 he was employed as a clinical psychologist on the staff of the Lake County Mental Hygiene Clinic in Gary, Indiana. Continuing his studies, he received the Master of Arts degree in clinical psychology in February of 1958. During this time he was employed part time as a lecturer in the undergraduate department of psychology at Loyola. In September of 1960 he was employed as a part time research assistant in psychology to work for a year in the Religion and Mental Health project at Loyola. In March of 1962 he left his positions in Gary and Chicago to take his present position at the newly formed Barron-Polk Guidance Clinic in Turtle Lake, Wisconsin. During the summer of 1962 he was formally made the administrator of that clinic in addition to his duties as the clinical psychologist.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was made possible by the writer's participation in the Loyola University Project on Religion and Mental Health, and thanks are due to all members of the Advisory Committee of the project for their approval and support. The author wishes to express special thanks and appreciation to Rev. Vincent V. Herr, S.J., Director of the project, for his constant help and encouragement throughout every phase of the work involved in this dissertation. Father Herr helped develop the general plan of the research and contributed many of the ideas used in the construction of the questionnaire. He helped arrange for the collection of the data, and was always generous with his time and advice whenever problems arose in the work.

An expression of appreciation is due to the rector of the minor seminary where the questionnaire was administered, and to the priest-instructor who arranged for the writer to give the questionnaire to two of his classes in the seminary. Thanks are likewise due to the priest-principal of the school from which the high school subjects were obtained, who was most cooperative and accommodating in making arrangements to suit the demands of the research design. It is regretted that the need to keep the names of the schools anonymous makes it necessary to omit the names of these three priests.

The author wishes to express his gratitude to Elizabeth Kundert, M.D., psychiatrist-director of the Barron-Polk Guidance Clinic, for her encouragement and her generosity about allowing adjustments to be made in his working

schedule at the clinic so that this research could be completed.

The writer wishes to acknowledge the support and help of his wife; she contributed valuable criticisms of the manuscript in the course of typing and proof-reading both the readers' and final copies of this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	3
The Role of the Priest	3
Babin's Study	12
Evaluation of Babin's Study	24
Study of the Four Belgian Nuns	29
Evaluation of the Study of the Four Belgian Nuns	42
The Loyola Study Reported by Herr	44
Evaluation of the Loyola Study	48
Questions Asked Parishioners by Fichter and Schuyler	49
Lhota's Study	55
Bier's Study	59
Evaluation of Bier's Study	64
Murray's Article	66
III. CONSTRUCTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY	70
The Main Hypotheses of this Study	72
Basic Format of the Questions	73
Question One	74
Question Two	77
Some Secondary Hypotheses	77
Question Three	79
Question Four	79
Question Five	81
Question Six	81
Introductory Statement to the Questionnaire	84
Information Obtained from the Subjects about Themselves	84
IV. PROCEDURE OF DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS	88
Administration of the Questionnaire	88
Analysis of Data for Group Differences	88
The Use of Representative Scores	92
Invalid Answers	93
Group Differences For Items Combined	93

V. DESCRIPTION OF THE GROUPS STUDIED	95
Ages of Subjects	95
Subjects' Place of Birth and Where They Lived	
Most of Their Lives	96
Occupations of the Subjects' Parents	97
Parents' Place of Birth and Where They Lived	
Most of Their Lives	98
Religion of the Subjects and Their Parents	99
Near Relatives Known to Have Pursued	
a Priestly or Religious Vocation	101
Type of Schools Attended by Subjects	101
Other Information About the Subjects	103
VI. RESULTS	105
Question One	105
Question One-Ranking (1R)	111
Comparisons Between Results of Questions One and 1R	117
Question Two	122
Question 2R	129
Comparisons Between Results of Questions Two and 2R	133
Question Three	138
Question Four	148
Question Five	155
Question Six	162
VII. SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE HYPOTHESES AND TO PREVIOUS STUDIES	170
Evidence For Similarity in the Groups' Opinions	170
Summary by Questions	171
Summary by Vocation, Age and Subject Groups	181
Significance of Results for Hypotheses	184
Relationship of Results to Previous Studies	184
VIII. SUMMARY	190
BIBLIOGRAPHY	195

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. MEAN RANKS ASSIGNED TO DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRIESTS BY FRENCH ADOLESCENTS	15
2. QUALITIES OF PRIESTS MENTIONED BY 300 FRENCH BOYS, AGE 11-19	17
3. PERCENTAGES OF FRENCH GIRLS MENTIONING CATEGORIES OF QUALITIES DESIRED IN THE IDEAL NUN	21
4. PERCENTAGES OF FRENCH GIRLS MENTIONING THE THINGS THEY CONSIDER IMPORTANT IN THE RELIGIOUS LIFE	22
5. PERCENTAGES OF FRENCH GIRLS CHECKING THE THING CONSIDERED MOST DIFFICULT FOR A GIRL ENTERING RELIGIOUS LIFE	23
6. PROFESSIONS CONSIDERED MOST AND LEAST LIKE THE PRIESTHOOD BY BELGIAN GIRLS	31
7. OPINIONS OF BELGIAN GIRLS ABOUT WHY ONLY MEN ARE PRIESTS . .	32
8. OPINIONS OF BELGIAN GIRLS ABOUT WHY PRIESTS CANNOT MARRY . .	34
9. PERCENTAGES OF BELGIAN GIRLS SELECTING ONE OF SIX ALTERNATIVES AS THE BEST COUNSEL TO GIVE TO A CHAPLAIN FOR YOUNG GIRLS	35
10. TEN QUALITIES OR VIRTUES AND THE ORDER IN WHICH BELGIAN GIRLS PREFER THEM IN PRIESTS	36
11. PERCENTAGE OF BELGIAN GIRLS SELECTING ONE OF SEVEN ALTERNATIVES AS THE PRINCIPAL REASON WHY CHRISTIAN GIRLS STOP PRACTICING THEIR RELIGION	37
12. REPLIES OF BELGIAN GIRLS TO THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THEY WOULD WANT THEIR SON TO BE A PRIEST	38
13. PERCENTAGES OF BELGIAN GIRLS GIVING POSSIBLE EXPLANATION FOR AVOIDANCE OF A PRIEST BY A HYPOTHETICAL 16 YEAR OLD GIRL	39

14.	REACTIONS OF BELGIAN GIRLS TO POSSIBILITY OF RECEIVING ABSOLUTION FROM A PRIEST IN STATE OF MORTAL SIN	40
15.	REACTIONS OF BELGIAN GIRLS TO ADVICE THAT A YOUNG GIRL WITH AN EMBARRASSING PROBLEM GO TO A PRIEST	41
16.	CATHOLIC LEADERS' OPINIONS ABOUT THE TYPES OF LEADER- SHIP THE PRIEST SHOULD TAKE IN PARISH ORGANIZATIONS ON MATTERS NOT INVOLVING FAITH AND MORALS	50
17.	NEW YORK CITY PARISHIONERS' ESTIMATES OF THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF ELEVEN DUTIES CARRIED ON BY THE PRIEST	53
18.	PERCENTAGES OF PRIESTS AND THEOLOGY STUDENTS WHO OBTAINED VARIOUS RATINGS ON LHOTA'S CLERICAL INTEREST SCALE	57
19.	PERCENTAGES OF BOYS FALLING INTO STRONG'S INTEREST CATEGORIES ON LHOTA'S CLERICAL INTEREST SCALE	58
20.	SCORES OF COLLEGIANS COMPARED WITH SCORES OF PRIESTS AND SEMINARIANS ON LHOTA'S CLERICAL SCALE OF THE STRONG VOCATIONAL INTEREST BLANK	68
21.	INFORMATION ABOUT THE AGES OF THE SUBJECTS AT THE TIME OF TAKING THE QUESTIONNAIRE	96
22.	WHERE SUBJECTS WERE BORN AND REPORTED HAVING LIVED MOST OF THEIR LIVES	97
23.	EXPERIMENTER'S CLASSIFICATION OF REPORTED OCCUPATIONS OF SUBJECTS' PARENTS	98
24.	WHERE SUBJECTS' FATHERS WERE REPORTED BORN AND HAVING LIVED MOST OF LIVES	99
25.	WHERE SUBJECTS' MOTHERS WERE REPORTED BORN AND HAVING LIVED MOST OF LIVES	100
26.	NEAR RELATIVES OF SUBJECTS KNOWN TO HAVE BECOME, OR STUDIED FOR BECOMING, PRIESTS OR NUNS	102
27.	PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION ONE	107-108
28.	MEAN RANK SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION ONE-R	113-114

29.	PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION TWO	124-125
30.	MEAN RANK SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION TWO-R	130-131
31.	PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION THREE	140-141
32.	PROPORTION SCORES OF GROUPS ON COMBINATIONS OF ITEMS IN QUESTION THREE	147
33.	DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON COMBINATIONS OF ITEMS IN QUESTION THREE	147
34.	PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION FOUR	150-151
35.	PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION FIVE	157-158
36.	PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION SIX	163-164

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1956 the National Institute of Mental Health awarded research grants to three universities for the purpose of investigating areas of possible relationship between the fields of religion and mental health. At Loyola University this led to the formation of The Loyola University Project on Religion and Mental Health which has had as a major goal the development of mental health curricular materials and methods for use in the training of Catholic seminarians. (See Kobler et al., 1959; Herr et al., 1960; and Herr, 1962 for reports on the purposes and activities of the Loyola project.)

This dissertation grew out of the writer's association with the Loyola project and stems largely from a curiosity on the part of many project participants about what type of individual seeks the priestly vocation. There was also considerable interest in developing questionnaire materials for the purpose of assessing group opinions about the priesthood, and this interest played an important role in determining the focus of this dissertation. Thus it was decided to develop questionnaire methods for assessing opinions about various aspects of the priesthood, and to determine what differences might exist between minor seminarians and comparable Catholic high school students in their responses to the questionnaire items. Ninth and twelfth grade students were selected in order to gain some idea about the influence of age

(and all that it means in terms of experience and training) on these opinions.

An attempt has been made to build on previous work done in the area of constructing questionnaire materials for tapping opinions about the priesthood. The following chapter contains a complete review of the few studies found that contained such materials. Since this task seemed related to the topic of the many roles associated with the priesthood, there is also a brief review of some sociological literature found on this topic. Finally, chapter two also includes a review of some work done which compared seminarian with non-seminarian groups in respect to certain personality or interest patterns.

Following this review of the literature, chapter three tells about the construction of the questionnaire items used in this dissertation, and gives the hypotheses being investigated through the administration of the questionnaire. Then come two chapters giving the general procedures involved in data collection and analysis (chapter four), and a description of the subject groups to whom the questionnaire was given (chapter five).

In chapter six an item-by-item analysis of the results is given; it is followed by chapter seven which gives a general summary of the results and relates them to the hypotheses stated in chapter three. Chapter seven also relates the results to the findings of previous studies where a basis for doing so appears to exist. The dissertation is closed with a brief summary which includes some ideas and suggestions for doing further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

There are three published reports giving systematic studies of attitudes toward the priest and his work (Babin, 1953; Anonymous, 1957; Herr, to be published), and these will be reviewed thoroughly here. In addition two studies in parish sociology were found which contain results of questions given to parishioners touching on some aspects of their attitudes about the priesthood (Fichter, 1954 and Schuyler, 1960). Both of these reports also contain discussions about the priesthood and priestly roles, and will be reviewed here insofar as they deal with this topic also. Several other references cited contain discussions about the priesthood (most notably Fichter, 1961), but will not be reviewed to any great extent here. Finally, three studies have been found that compare seminarians and non-seminarians with respect to personality traits (Lhota, 1948; Bler, 1948; Murray, 1959); because they compare the two kinds of groups used in this thesis, these studies will be reviewed even though they bear only indirectly on the subject matter to be explored here, namely, opinions about the priesthood.

The Role of the Priest

There are, of course, countless works which touch in one way or another on the role of the priest. While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to attempt to treat the topic comprehensively, some attention to it appears in order. Chapter ten of Fichter's study of a midwestern United States parish (1954) is

devoted to an excellent discussion of the roles of the parish priest from a sociological viewpoint.

Fichter begins by defining social roles as a combination of institutionalized patterns, or of recurrent uniformities of thought and behavior centering around a set of social needs. He notes that such patterns are formed partly by the historical way of doing things and partly by the exigencies of particular circumstances. After noting that Kimball Young (1942) mentions several roles wider than that of parish priest which a religious functionary may follow—namely those of teacher, missionary, religious executive, mystic and prophet—Fichter makes clear that his discussion is limited to the roles of the parish priest.

He notes that the main purpose of the church on earth is the sanctification and salvation of souls. The all-embracing role of the priest, therefore, is bound up in this religious goal. The parish priest carries out this role in his relationships with parishioners through the fulfillment of two major or predominant functions: that of Mediator between man and God in which his spiritual ministrations provide parishioners with a channel of grace; and that of Spiritual Father taking a pastoral interest in the care of souls including providing them with instruction, counsel and assistance for their moral and personal problems. He includes under the priest's paternal function the completely confidential relationship involved in sacramental confession and a kind of "trouble-shooting" role in which he is called upon to "do something" about such things as the drunken husband, delinquent boy, or girl in trouble. He then states that the fatherly influence of the priest on his parishioner's moral and social behavior has diminished greatly since his relationship with them has

become relatively depersonalized in the "quickened modern life of the urban Catholic parish." (Fichter, 1954, p.126) Later in this same vein he adds a footnote about counseling, saying it "is still a large part of the priest's function, but the 'cases' have multiplied so greatly and other demands on the priest's time have so increased that the 'follow-up' is now almost impossible." (ibid., p.127)

Fichter then notes seven "specific roles" which might be attributed to the parish priest in addition to the above two "generic" or "basic transcendental roles" which permeate all he does. He makes it clear that he does not consider his differentiations to be necessarily complete or final.

The first of these he calls the communal role, within which the priest-parishioner relationship becomes socialized. On the priest's part this social relationship requires knowledge of each parishioner as a member of society playing a variety of social roles--such as member of a family, of a neighborhood, of an occupational group, of recreational and of other groups.

Next is mentioned the administrative role, following from the fact that the priest is responsible for the administration of all parish activities and societies. In Fichter's words the priest "must be an organizer and manager of the social relations and structures which center in the parish." (ibid, p.129)

The priest also has a businessman role, Fichter notes, which represents a relatively new or recent demand on him stemming from the fact that he takes the ultimate responsibility for all parish finances.

The civic role of the priest is discussed next. Fichter notes that the priest is a respected and influential member of the community, hence he often is expected or even forced to play a large part in various community activities

including membership on civic committees, participation in many drives, and so forth. In addition the priest is the symbol and interpreter of Catholicism in the community.

A recreational role is mentioned next insofar as the priest must guide and manage the athletic and recreational groups and facilities of the parish.

The term ameliorative role is applied to those functions whereby the priest must carry on organizational duties in relation to the parish groups which perform corporal works of mercy.

Next is mentioned an educational role, which consists essentially in the teaching of Christian doctrine by the priest—through such things as sermons, private counseling and the operation of the parochial school. Fichter notes this role is very broad in scope, but that sociologically speaking the principal test of how well the priest fulfills this role is his preaching. I would question this for two reasons. First there seems to be a growing tendency for messages to be sent to parishioners in written form, such as in a weekly parish bulletin or in letters sent through the mail. Second, if the priest's counseling functions are to be considered a part of this role—I myself would find no objection to differentiating it as a "specific role" in its own right—then strong consideration should be given to the possibility that such functions also have strong sociological significance for this educational role. I am thinking particularly of the educational aspect of counseling whereby the priest may play a crucial role in helping the parishioner to learn and develop practical applications of Christian doctrine to his or her own daily life.

The next role Fichter calls sociospiritual to designate the priest's functions performed in relation to parish groups which are mainly spiritual in their

goals—such as sodalities, Holy Name, and Catholic Action groups.

The liturgical role is the last one differentiated by Father Fichter. He notes that it is centered primarily around parish religious services which are a public example of the priest's transcendental role as Mediator. He explains that this "specific role" consists mainly of coordinating and integrating the activities of many other persons besides himself as all play a part in religious services—including the acolytes, choir, ushers, members of the Altar Society, and so forth. Perhaps a secondary title for these functions might be to call them the ceremonial role of the priest.

At this point, before continuing with Fichter's remarks about the roles of the priest, it seems appropriate to mention some other discussions which appear pertinent to this topic. The most notable of these for the present purpose is a chapter on the parish priests in Schuyler's parish study (Schuyler, 1960, chapter 7). Schuyler notes that within its territory the goals of the parish are the same as those of the church as a whole. He summarizes these goals by saying that "the parish aims to assist people to achieve holiness—that is, union with God—and, because of it, fraternal community among men. This is another way of saying that church and parish seek to implement what Christianity's founder designated as the two greatest commandments: love of God and love of neighbor." (ibid, p.140) He goes on to say that the members of the Church, like those of any other social organization, necessarily have certain statuses and roles as they strive together to achieve its goals. To put it in his words: "The parish is in no way different from other societies in these respects. It has its purposes, its interaction to achieve them, and a structure of relationships implicit in and developed by that interaction.

Relationships have a structure of their own, consisting of the respective statuses of their members and the roles which they play in regard to each other." (ibid, p.141-142) He then points out that the most important and significant relationship in a Catholic parish is that between the priest and the other parishioners.

Father Schuyler then notes that the role of the priest and his status in the church is rooted in Catholic theology. He quotes a passage from Cardinal Suhard's pastoral letter which represents a good expression of this fact.

Cardinal Suhard said:

"The priesthood is not a derivatory function. It cannot be artificially constructed at our pleasure from the confusion and partial order of society. It is not a supererogation or a ritual garb. It changes the priest in his very essence. It is given from on high. It is unique, permanent, eternal. It must be accepted for what it is, not as something rising from experience but as both the original source and the fulfillment of all the imperfect foreshadowings of it found in the history of religions. This priesthood is the priesthood of Jesus Christ, Son of God. Being a priest in the social order is not a matter of inventing functions but of continuing by Christ's grace His unique priesthood in His Mystical Body which is the Church.

"To be a priest means to perpetuate Christ just as He is, throughout time and space. It means to preserve Him unchanged, throughout the course of history, identical under the most diverse forms of social life, without subtracting anything from His priesthood, without adding anything to it, but not without making Christ perceptible and communicable. Here we have to make an important distinction, one that we have also made in regard to the Church. Just as there is in the Church a transcendent aspect which constitutes its mystery, and a contingent and temporal aspect which constitutes its successive incarnations, so is it also with the priest. He can be seen from the point of view of time or of eternity. To be a priest in the social order means to perpetuate the immutable and essential elements of Christ's priesthood, that is to say His mysterious mediation, under the constantly recurring aspects of time." (Suhard, 1947, p.6)

So, Schuyler adds, the Catholic priest is a priest only insofar as he exercises

the priesthood of Christ. Not all sociologists or non-Catholics may accept this fact, but to understand the role of the priest they must understand that practising Catholics believe it and live by it in their relations with priests.

Continuing from Suhard's lead, Schuyler notes that in Catholic theology Christ is prince or ruler, prophet or teacher, and priest or mediator. Hence the priest, in carrying on the only true and effective priesthood—that of Christ—is most essentially and eminently mediator between God and men, which function or role comprehends or includes all others that are a part of the priesthood, including those of ruler and teacher.

The Church has always spoken of the priest as exercising the twin roles of father and mediator, Schuyler goes on. Insofar as his mediating role between God and man involves the dispensing of God's grace to men through the Mass and Sacraments, the priest plays the role of spiritual father. And insofar as he makes offerings to God in behalf of men—most notably and essentially, the Mass, or Christ's offering of Himself as the only true sacrifice or gift by which adequate praise, thanks, atonement and petition may be made to God—then the priest mediates in the other direction between man and God. Together these twin roles make up the core of the priesthood, and all other priestly roles are derivatives of them and secondary to them.

Fichter's elaboration of priestly roles is mentioned and they are named; Schuyler notes that one question given to parishioners in the questionnaire administered as part of his parish study asks them to rate the relative importance of various roles of the priest; and the list of roles given was based largely on Fichter's differentiations. The results of this question are given later in this review. There is a fine elaboration of the point that all the

roles of the priest are permeated to a greater or lesser degree with the primary roles of father and mediator. Finally, Schuyler's discussion goes into a concrete example, namely, that of the functions performed by the priests in the parish he studied.

There are two other works having some bearing on this topic which might be mentioned here. One has already been mentioned, namely, the inspiring pastoral letter by Emmanuel Cardinal Suhard (1947) dealing with the nature of the priesthood, the social position and significance of the priesthood, and the reciprocal relations which are desirable between the priest and the laity in their common apostolate as followers of Christ. Another is a large book by Pfliegler (1957) dealing with the priesthood from a more or less existential point of view. Pfliegler discusses the different types of role that priests have played, and also different types of priests in terms of how they react personally to the fact they are priests and to the different social situations they find themselves living in as priests. The book is written from a subjective-analytical point of view and contains much interesting biographical material. It includes discussions dealing with various stages, problems and pitfalls involved in the priestly life.

Hence Fichter's (1954) and Schuyler's (1960) studies appear to be the only ones to date in which an attempt was made from a psychological or sociological point of view to designate some of the secondary roles of the priest. One further thing Fichter did, in the concluding remarks of his chapter devoted to this topic, was to discuss these secondary roles in relation to the natural or human abilities of the priests called upon to perform them:

"The multiple needs of the parish, as an aggregate of persons who are serving God and trying to save their souls, are therefore roughly correlated with the multiple-functioning roles performed by the priests. Throughout this whole analysis it is obvious that the personality and the abilities of the priest must be taken into consideration. While the ideal pattern may be a correlation between the priest's interest and competence and the specific roles assigned to him, it is often true that this ideal alignment does not exist. In parishes where there are three or four priests there may be some juggling of roles and persons so that the best result can be obtained. But no priest can do all things well. Some are excellent administrators; others are liturgical experts, youth leaders, preachers, builders, or public relations experts.

"Two facts, however, stand out. The first is that each priest must have some minimum adeptness in each role. The second is that the priest must conform to the needs of the parish rather than insist upon doing only that for which he is best trained or in which he has the greatest talent and interest. It is a striking anomaly in an age of specialization that the parish priest (unlike trained personnel in other professions and occupations) is forced to maintain an adaptive readiness to be 'all things to all men'. The relatively simple functional specificity, which involves the performance of sacramental and liturgical rites, and which appears to be the primary focus of sociological attention, is the role which gives the least trouble to the priest. His sociologically complex problem arises when he is expected by the needs of parishioners to be expert in all the other functions, even while he is expected by the demands of the organizational structure to emphasize the technical managerial functions which maintain the parish as a going social concern." (op. cite, 1954, p. 136-137.)

After reviewing the foregoing literature on the roles involved in the priestly life, it is clear indeed that the church calls all of its priestly members to be heroic saints. At the same time, one might wonder if consideration should be given to developing more specialization by priests with respect to some of the secondary functions they perform, and whether more efforts should be made to utilize the talents of others besides the priest so that he has a maximum of time and energy to devote to his more essential functions.

Before concluding this brief review of the role of the priest, mention should be made of Fichter's book which treats the religious life as an

occupation (1961); though it deals very little with issues directly pertinent to this thesis, it represents a very valuable background resource. This work gives an excellent treatment of the Catholic priesthood and other Catholic forms of the religious life considered as an occupational category and viewed in the context of current sociological theory and research. It is based on an up-to-date review of the sociologically pertinent empirical data available on the priesthood and hence is a valuable reference work for anyone interested in doing studies which deal with the priesthood or religious life in some way. There are three main sections in the book: The first is a group of chapters dealing with factors related to the taking up of a religious vocation; the second is a group of chapters dealing with the nature of the vocational work done by priests and other religious functionaries, written primarily from a sociological point of view; the third deals with the religious vocation viewed in the context of the Church as a social organization having various goals and characteristics.

With this brief review of literature on the roles of the priest being completed, we shall now turn to an examination of the pertinent questionnaire studies mentioned at the start of this chapter.

Babin's Study

The first such study to be reviewed is that reported by Pierre Babin, O.M.I. (1953). The object of his study was to discover what young people think of the priestly life, including what attracts them to it, what objections they have to it, and what type of priest or nun they desire. It was hoped that some light would be thrown on the problem of recruiting for the priesthood and also of providing suitable orientation for the Christian life of children.

To this end Father Labin directed the administration of a questionnaire to boys in secondary schools, and to girls in five secondary boarding schools. The schools were located in large towns in France. Sheets of questions were distributed to each group covered. Pupils were required to give only their age, and had the option of omitting their name from their sheets. Pupils were told they could leave blank any question they did not wish to answer. The sheets were usually administered by the pupils' spiritual directors or religious teachers. Afterwards discussions were held with the pupils to clarify their ideas further.

On the basis of age and sex, six groups of subjects were differentiated in the reporting of results: pre-adolescent boys and girls (ages 11-13); adolescent boys (ages 14-16) and girls (ages 14-15); and older boys (ages 17-19) and girls (ages 16-18). Each group contained one hundred individuals. Complete results were not published, but only what the author called the most significant points about the children's opinions.

The first question reported, given to both boys and girls, required them to rank in order of preference ten kinds of priests described as follows:

- "—The priest who preaches mission retreats in the French parishes.
- The priest who works among the poor and working classes.
- The priest in charge of a sanctuary of the Blessed Virgin.
- The foreign missionary priest.
- The priest-worker.
- The priest who works among young people as leader or spiritual advisor.
- The priest who teaches.
- The parish priest.
- The priest who is a monk.
- The priest who directs Catholic Action Movements."

The results are reported separately for each of the six groups of subjects. The percentage of the group which assigned each rank to the type of priest is

given. There was no further statistical treatment of the data. Global preference results (or ranks) are given for the combined groups based on taking the general average for each type of priest. The order of combined preference is given in Table 1, which also gives the mean ranks assigned to each type of priest by the six groups of subjects and by all six groups combined. These mean ranks were computed from the data given in Rabin's percentage data reported in Table I of his report.

In his discussion of these results, Rabin says that the first and last three choices were the same for all subject groups. He considers this clear evidence that children associate the idea of the priesthood with the most active forms of the apostolic life, and that they like priests to be heroic, close to the world and to the poor. He goes on to report that the older adolescents do not give such great preference to the missionary as do the younger subjects, and also that subjects in some of the schools ranked the missionary below the priest working among the poor and working classes. Father Rabin also notes that the older boys tend to give the priest occupied with youth a lower place than do the younger groups, whereas the older girls tend to do the opposite. This is interpreted as a kind of reaction against priestly interference by the older boys, and a welcoming of it more than before by the older girls. This same interpretation is attached to the fact that older girls favor the teaching priest more than do the older boys. The discussions revealed that one reason the priest-teacher is ranked below "the parochial clergy", especially by the older children, is because the priest-teacher is seen as mainly concerned with discipline. Moreover, Father Rabin reports that the duties of the parish priest are not considered nor hardly understood by the younger groups; whereas

MEAN RANKS ASSIGNED TO DIFFERENT TYPES OF PRIESTS BY FRENCH ADOLESCENTS

(Adapted from Babin, 1953)

Type of Priest (In order of Preference)	Subject Group (All groups have N of 100)						All Groups (N=600)
	Preadolescent		Adolescent		Older		
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	
1. Foreign missionary	2.54	2.19	2.28	2.56	3.21	2.69	2.58
2. The priest working among the poor and working classes	3.42	3.66	3.76	3.31	3.27	3.30	3.45
3. The priest-worker	4.33	5.56	3.42	3.65	4.18	3.75	4.15
4. The priest occupied with youth	4.82	4.55	4.74	3.62	4.70	4.02	4.41
5. The parish priest	5.32	5.18	5.63	5.10	4.27	4.75	5.04
6. The preacher of missions and retreats	5.76	5.80	5.78	5.81	5.66	6.12	5.82
7. The priest chaplain to Catholic Action	6.14	6.67	6.03	6.72	5.96	6.52	6.34
8. The priest-teacher	6.87	6.71	7.13	6.63	7.49	6.31	6.86
9. The monk	7.65	7.06	7.38	7.89	6.60	6.82	7.23
10. The priest in charge of a shrine of our Lady	6.80	7.74	6.73	8.04	8.85	8.65	7.80

the older groups, especially the boys, seem to gain much more awareness of them and so attach relatively greater preference to the parish priest. The

discussions also revealed that the priest-worker's popularity often falls very low because of severe criticisms heard at home. Also the groups did not know exactly what Catholic action signified. Finally, the priest in charge of a shrine to our Lady was seen as someone who has been "shelved".

In a footnote Father Babin notes that the results from this question are very similar to those obtained from the girls when asked to give their order of preference for five kinds of religious life. The five kinds of religious life, in the order preferred by the girls, were:

1. Missionary nuns.
2. Nuns looking after the poor and sick.
3. Teaching nuns.
4. Nuns doing parish work.
5. Contemplative nuns.

The next question reported by Babin, given only to the boys, had two parts:

- "1. Draw the portrait of a priest in words in five or six lines.
2. What qualities have struck you in the priests you have met?"

Results from these two parts combined were given in table form (see table 2), and then were discussed as qualities which the boys considered to be sacerdotal in nature. Babin notes that a large number of expressions were used, so that the process by which they were eventually reduced to one of the four major categories in the table was difficult. The four categories in the order of importance imputed to them on the basis of this categorization or reduction process (done by Babin) are given in table 2. Babin goes on to discuss the results from this twofold question at great length. He notes that the boys strongly emphasize that the priest should be concerned with his fellow man as a friend who is (a) receptive to all that is human, (b) adaptable to all that is human, and (c) one with all men through love. The insistence that the priest be

QUALITIES OF PRIESTS MENTIONED BY 300 FRENCH BOYS, AGE 11-19

(From Rabin, 1953)

Quality	Number Of Boys Mentioning In:	
	Question One (Portrait)	Question Two (Qualities)
1. Goodness: Graciousness.....	147	172
Devotion to men.....	41	87
Understanding.....	-	77
2. Dynamism: Ardour. A young spirit....	67	54
3. Theological Virtues:		
Man of God.....	58	41
Devoted to his ideal.....	15	-
Holy.....	11	18
A man of the mass and sacraments.....	10	-
4. Qualities of a Leader:		
A model leader.....	35	-
Willpower, energy, a worker.....	36	32

concerned with human values—called the "incarnation" value by Rabin—goes very deep, to the point where some boys say that the reason some priests are not successful is because they are "too much a man of God". While the boys do expect the priest to possess spiritual values and qualities, to be "the man of God" so to speak, Rabin notes that they seem to have some faulty conceptions about this.

Thus they (1) confuse the "mystic" with the man whose feet are not on the ground, the "man of God" with the man who is above human problems, the "saint" with a man apart and at a different level from the rest of humanity. Rabin interprets this result as due to a serious confusion in the children's minds, namely, that shortcomings in the priest are seen as the consequence of an excess in the spiritual and supernatural instead of as the result of insufficient charity and adult maturity. In short, failings in the priest are attributed to the priestly ideal and to God. Rabin considers this due not only to the notion that priests are cut off from other people, but also to an unconscious tendency on the part of the children to relate shortcomings in priests to the idea that priests are disassociated from the paramount values of the world (e.g. money, amusements). He relates this to the lack of recruits for the priesthood in boys, giving an account of the response from a group of older boys who were asked why recruits are so few. Rabin concludes this point by saying the main reason is because the priesthood no longer has prestige in the present world, that it appears to be something outside human life, involving standards unknown to the modern world.

(2) Rabin notes further that: "The boys are quite willing to admit that the priest should be a Man of God, but they do not always mean the same thing as we do." By this Rabin seems to mean that the boys agree in wanting the priest to be penetrated by the divine and living in close contact with our Lord, but disagree (with the "we" in the above quote) because they want the spiritual life to manifest itself only from within the priest and not in the form of many manifest expressions. The boys want the priest to be "like everyone else" in his actions, so that his spirituality shines through from an inner

faith in God and meaningful acts of charity. The boys have little use for the priest who spends too much time in church, who insists on exercises of piety or who is a man of the Sacraments and of the breviary. Babin again notes that here the "incarnation" value attached to the priest shows through as pre-eminent in the opinions of the boys.

(3) Babin next notes that the boys emphasize an evangelical concept of the priest while opposing or criticizing the purely monastic or contemplative life. This includes some disdain of intellectual, speculative values in favor of action and love. There also is a tendency for the boys to fail to distinguish between the contemplative as opposed to the active apostle, so they want the priest to be a contemplative in action. They emphasize as ideal a priest who is like their concept of Christ, namely, someone who is not concerned with rules or material cares in his zeal to serve humanity in all ways possible. Moreover, the boys see Jesus as primarily dedicated to mankind and its salvation, and not so much as dedicated to the cause of serving the Father.

(4) Finally, the boys emphasize that the priest should develop his human abilities to the fullest in order to be an effective minister and so that he can adapt to the conditions of the world about him. Among the human qualities emphasized, Babin reports, are that the priest be: (a) young-minded, dynamic, athletic, enterprising; (b) a good preacher; (c) energetic, possessed of the spirit of leadership; and (d) sincere and loyal.

The last part of Babin's article reports questions put to the girls about nuns. In the first of this group of questions, the girls were asked to draw in five or six lines the portrait of the nun whom they would like to meet. The results of this question were reported in a table entitled: "Typical qualities

of the ideal nun". The table gives seven groupings of qualities mentioned by the girls; after each category of qualities, the number of girls who mentioned it are given separately for each age group. (These are percentages since there were one hundred in each such group.) These figures are followed by the total number of girls from all three groups who mentioned the category, and by the percentage of all three hundred girls which this total number represents. A summary of these results is given in table 3. Babin notes that the first three categories supplement or repeat one another, and that nuns seeing these results say it is an idea which is present everywhere at all ages. This idea, Babin continues, corresponds to the "incarnation" value found in the questions put to the boys about qualities desired in priests. The children want their priests and nuns to be human and close to humanity, able to give themselves to others, and "adaptable" to human values and needs.

The next question put to the girls was to ask their opinion of the most important thing in the religious life. The results were tabulated in the same way as for the previous question, and are summarized in table 4 (adapted from Babin's Table IV).

Finally, the girls were asked their opinion of what the young girl entering religious life would find most difficult: The habit, enclosure, obedience, the vows, the rule, or community life. The results from this question are summarized in table 5 (adapted from Babin's Table V).

Babin then discusses the results of all three of these questions together. He repeats that the girls give chief importance to the value of "incarnation". They want nuns to be "modern", "up to date", "aware of the problems of today". Moreover, Babin comments:

PERCENTAGES OF FRENCH GIRLS MENTIONING CATEGORIES OF QUALITIES

DESIRED IN THE IDEAL NUN

(From Babin, 1953)

Qualities	Per Cent of Girls Mentioning From Groups: (Each Age Group has N of 100)			
	Ages 11-13	Ages 14-15	Ages 16-18	All (N=300)
1. Comprehensive; broadminded; knowing life; aware of the problems of the day; etc.	31	71	83	61.7
2. A young mind; smiling; gay; lively; enjoying games; etc.	49	79	54	59.6
3. Good; devoted; an apostle; affable; maternal; loving; etc.	78	40	49	55.7
4. Teaching qualities: intelligent, cultured, creating confidence, firm but not too severe, etc.	38	62	49	49.7
5. Human virtues: simple, gentle, patient, discreet, frank, just	53	46	42	47.0
6. Interior life: pious, radiating love of God but without too many exterior signs of piety, etc.	33	24	41	32.7
7. Exterior: agreeable, sympathetic,	15	26	15	18.0

"If obedience and enclosure have been classified as demanding the greatest effort in religious life, it is not only because these children fail to understand their inner meaning, nor for love of independence; it seems rather that obedience and the enclosure appear to them as the chief obstacles to this human development and awareness of the world which they want above all to find in nuns."

**PERCENTAGES OF FRENCH GIRLS MENTIONING THE THINGS THEY
CONSIDER IMPORTANT IN THE RELIGIOUS LIFE
(From Babin, 1953)**

Important Things	Per Cent of Girls Mentioning From Group: (Each Age Group has N of 100)			
	Ages 11-13	Ages 14-15	Ages 16-18	All (N=300)
1. The total gift of oneself to one's neighbor. Readiness to help others. Devotedness, love for others.	17	44	43	34.6
2. Prayer.	24	23	28	25.0
3. Obedience. Observance of rules.	21	30	21	24.0
4. The gift of oneself to God. The love of God and of Christ. The service of God.	18	24	23	21.7
5. The vows.	22	13	7	14.0
6. Renunciation. Humility. Detachment.	4	10	21	11.7
7. Joy. Kindness. Good humor.	2	8	5	5.0

Babin goes on that the girls appear to want the man to be more than just a perfectly developed human personality. This is shown by how many consider either prayer or the entire gift of oneself to God as being the essence of religious life, and also by how many mention the importance of a profound interior life as a desirable quality in the ideal man. In short, the desired human

**PERCENTAGES OF FRENCH GIRLS CHECKING THE THING CONSIDERED MOST
DIFFICULT FOR A GIRL ENTERING RELIGIOUS LIFE**

(From Babin, 1953)

Per Cent of Girls Mentioning From Age Group:
(Each Age Group has N of 100)

Difficult Thing	Ages 11-13	Ages 14-15	Ages 16-18	All (N=300)
1. Obedience	23	41	31	31.6
2. Enclosure	28	31	29	29.3
3. The Vows	28	12	11	17.0
4. The Rule	10	4	9	7.6
5. Community life	8	6	18	10.6
6. The habit	4	6	2	4.0

qualities in a nun are not seen as satisfactory unless they flow from a genuine interior spiritual life. Yet the girls do not want the supernatural life of the nun to be cut off from action or from the world; they want their ideal nun to be contemplative, but also in action by giving herself to others.

In his summary and conclusions, Babin cautions that his population sample is primarily a middle class urban group, and that other results might be found from young people of the rural or working classes. He emphasizes that beyond the figures and quotations given, his report steps into a realm of interpretation which is debatable. He does not agree with the conclusion of some of the advance readers of his results that there is a lowering of the standards of

faith in young people. He is convinced that young people are seeking authentic religious standards, but that they have many false ideas that need correcting. He ends by exhorting that young people be given an ideal of the religious life which is not against their thinking, but which "must be adapted to mass mentality and surpass it".

Evaluation of Babin's Study

Without a doubt Babin's pioneer research effort (at least insofar as what is published on this topic is concerned) represents an extensive and perceptive attempt to find out what young people in France are thinking about the priesthood and religious life. Keeping this overall evaluation in mind, some shortcomings of his report should be noted.

One difficulty is that Babin never explains how he was able to arrange his reporting of results so that each group for every question always had an N of 100. One assumes that if a selection of students—random or otherwise—was taken from five schools, and if these students were then told they could refuse to answer questions that were too hard, that the number validly answering each question would vary, and that the chances of getting an N of 100 for any of the questions is very doubtful. One must conclude therefore that the constant N of 100 results from some kind of selection process by which the experimenter ended up with an even one hundred individuals who had answered each question validly and intelligibly. Yet Babin does not say a word about how this was done, nor does he give any indication of whether there were any students who spoiled or did not give an answer at all to any of the questions reported.

A second difficulty is that Babin's statistical reporting often leaves

something to be desired. This was especially true for the results of the first question he discussed, which were reported in virtually raw form with no further refinements. Rabin apparently based all of his discussion about this question on the percentage scores (which are the same as the raw scores because each group had an N of 100). The table reporting these scores was exceedingly large and difficult to analyze meaningfully. No representative scores were given, nor was any statistical basis given for the reporting of differences between pupil groups. It should be noted that table 1 in this review of Rabin's study represents a refinement of his reported data. Moreover, table 1 contradicts Rabin's statement that all pupil groups had the same types of priests for their first three and last three choices. The mean ranks in table 1 suggest four exceptions to this general statement, all having to do with the female groups. The presence of such things in his statistical reporting makes Rabin's discussion of results hard to evaluate at times.

Next, there appears to be a subtle shift in Rabin's frame of reference when he discusses the results of questions about qualities of priests and nuns. This shift was not explicitly noted nor was there any convincing evidence shown which would appear to warrant it entirely. The nature of this shift was that the questions were discussed primarily in terms of the boys' ideas about the ideal priest, and the girls' ideas about the ideal nun, yet none of the questions asked the pupils to focus on ideal qualities as such. Undoubtedly the pupils tended to express qualities which they personally would like to see, and thus injected their subjective feelings quite prominently into their answers. Most likely this was desired by the experimenters, moreover, thereby giving the study a very valuable dimension. It is no wonder then that the

qualities they emphasized tended to be self-centered as opposed to God-centered. Adolescence is characterized by an intensification of self-concern in most individuals, this being related to an upsurge of physical changes and having many far-reaching psychological implications as well. Hence I think Babin's discussion gets somewhat out of focus when he stresses the misconceptions which adolescents have about the ideal qualities of priests or nuns. The qualities that lay persons would like to experience in their contacts with priests and nuns can be distinguished from what they think is essential for the ideal priest or nun, and getting them to focus on the former does not assure an experimenter that he will get a complete picture of their views on the latter. This is suggested by the results obtained when girls were asked to give their opinion of the most important things in religious life. The importance of mere human perfection, of pleasing human qualities, and of being worldly-wise are not nearly so prominent here as a stressing of spiritual self-sacrifice having a supernatural orientation. Just before this question Babin gave his most obvious example of this shift in his frame of reference: he asked the girls to give the portrait of the nun whom they would like to meet, then reports the tabulated results under the heading: "Typical qualities of the ideal nun."

Finally, in the same vein, a comment might be made about Babin's concern over the pupils' reaction against too much spirituality in priests and nuns. In defense of the pupils, it should be noted that we often try to cover or compensate for our human failings by an exaggeration of spiritual practices; moreover, this kind of thing can easily include the use of spiritual practices to avoid fulfilling our human responsibilities as perfectly as we might. Such an abuse of spiritual and religious practices is an old problem for religious

people, and certainly does not fit in with any ideal of the spiritual life. In this light, it perhaps is a little easier to see why young people may not have much time for explicit spiritual practices. Having intense emotionality connected with their ideas, and not having had much contact with the priest or nun who is too worldly, so to speak, they may well be emphasizing their feelings about the failing they have experienced most often, namely, that of trying to hide or substitute for failures in religious and human duties by an over-exaggeration of spiritual practices. One can see how, being intensely idealistic and demanding, adolescents would express much subjective dislike for this kind of failing. I do not think, therefore, that this trend noted in their answers is clear evidence of serious confusion in their minds about the ideal priest or nun, especially in view of the obvious intent of the study to tap their subjective feelings about priests and nuns.

From another perspective, moreover, the pupils might be seen as being in good company when they emphasize the incarnation value. Thus Fichter, in talking about the spiritual formation of religious functionaries, wrote:

"From the point of view of the apostolic works of the Church, and in the light of the ideal service to fellow man, there appears to be a subtle problem. An intensive realization of supernatural faith which concentrates on the power of God may develop an inverse concept of the unworthiness and inabilities of human beings. The notion that nothing earthly is really worthwhile may develop into a disregard for the natural talents and efforts of human beings. Divine indifference, rooted in a spiritual approach, may become downright aloofness from the concerns of the world.

"Pope Pius XII said: 'A supernaturalism that holds itself aloof, and especially one that keeps religion aloof, from economic and political needs and duties, as if these did not concern the Christian and the Catholic, is something unhealthy,

"something alien to the thinking of the Church."¹ It is probably also alien to the concept of the well-trained religious functionary to develop a supernaturalism that disregards the development of natural talents. God has the power to perform all the functions of all ecclesiastical functionaries in a better way and in less time than human beings. The fact that he calls upon human beings to perform these functions indicates that His servants cannot call upon Him to do their work." (Fichter, 1961, p.98-99.)

In another work while pointing out the values of sociological study for the church, Fichter quotes Cardinal Suhard:

"Impatient criticism has been made of the Church's failure to evolve with other social institutions and to develop with contemporary civil society. 'She has remained frozen in feudal forms which worked in times past. In our time, instead of being fused with society as she was in the middle ages when the parish and the commune had the same extension and the same life, the Church is "absent" from the City. She hovers over humanity instead of being incarnate in its flesh and blood. In her message to men she has everything she needs, even more than she needs, to animate the contemporary structures and to draw up plans for the future, but she does not use her resources. She lets strangers, or adversaries, take the decisive initiative on questions of doctrine, culture or action. When she acts or speaks, it is often too late. In scientific research, social legislation, or humanism she has few innovators. It is not in this way that she will win the world to Christ.'" (Fichter, 1961)²

In conclusion, Tabin's study is similar to the current one in its exploratory nature, yet differs in many respects. His population studied includes girls as well as boys, no seminarians, and is composed of French students from boarding schools as opposed to United States students from day schools. Tabin's purpose also differs from this study. He appeared interested in

¹In his address to members of Pax Christi, The Catholic Mind, LI, No. 1089 (Sept. 1953), p. 561.

²Quoted from Suhard, B. The Church Today. Fides Publishers, Chicago, 1953, p. 99.

studying adolescents who do not intend to become priests or religious to determine what they look for and desire in priests and nuns. He showed no great concern about clarifying differences between the different groups of subjects he studied, though such differences were not completely ignored. Moreover, what statistics he used did little more than give order and structure to his results. As already noted, his reporting of group differences and likenesses was based entirely on raw score or percentage figures. The present study, on the other hand, uses statistical tests of group differences as the primary focus for discussing the results. Finally, Babin's inquiry was broader in that he studied opinions about nuns as well as priests, whereas this study focuses only on the priesthood.

Study of the Four Belgian Nuns

This study (Anonymous, 1957) was aimed at gaining knowledge about the dispositions of adolescent girls toward the priesthood and related ecclesiastical realities. It was done by four nuns in Brussels whose identity was not revealed. They drew up a questionnaire and presented it to three hundred girls in the four secondary schools where they taught in Brussels. Replies to the questions were given anonymously by the girls, and were not seen by each nun herself but sent directly to Lumen Vitae (the publishing journal).

The questionnaire had two parts: a group of multiple choice questions, and a group of essay or completion questions. The first part was answered by 262 girls, and the second part by a varying number of girls—never fewer than 230 for any question. Those replying ranged in age from 14 to 20, with 80% being between 15 and 18. The girls were taken from four upper classes in the secondary schools; humanities, classical and modern, technical and professional

and physical education. Girls from middle-class families composed 75% of the sample, and those from working-class and lower middle-class 25%. Almost all their parents were Catholics, though some parents did not practice regularly. Most of the girls came from urban regions. Of the girls replying, 12% said they didn't know the name of their parish priest, 49% said they never saw the parish priest visit in their home, and 40% said they have a priest among their relatives.

The results were reported separately for each of the four schools in which the questionnaire was administered. For comparative purposes, the results for each of the four groups were given in percentage form; no combined percentages were reported. The results given in the article do not represent all the questions given to the girls, but only "those calling for psychopedagogical examination". The results given were divided into three general areas of inquiry: (1) Functions of the priest, (2) Virtues and failings and (3) Attitudes about priests.

The first question reported lists six professions after asking:

"If you had to compare the role of the priest to one of the following professions, which would you consider to be the nearest (underline)? Which would be the least likely (cross out)?"

Table 6 gives a summary of the results reported. It shows that the doctor clearly is considered the nearest; and the authors speculate that this could be due to linking the role of the doctor to that of the priest as the "doctor of the soul" in his sacramental functions, such as in the sacrament of Penance. The authors note that the connection with soldier is made more frequently by younger girls. Variation among groups in the rating of professor is attributed to the fact that priests teach religion in some schools and nuns in others.

PROFESSIONS CONSIDERED MOST AND LEAST LIKE THE PRIESTHOOD BY BELGIAN GIRLS

(Adapted from the study of four Belgian nuns, 1957)

Profession	Percent of Girls Rating It Most Alike from Group:					Percent of Girls Rating It Least Alike from Group:				
	A	B	C	D	All	A	B	C	D	All
Lawyer	1	2	2	4	2	10	11	9	13	11
Judge	8	6	9	0	6	20	38	20	13	24
Director	6	3	0	0	3	46	27	47	41	40
Professor	10	36	13	8	18	5	9	5	19	9
Doctor	73	45	65	76	64	4	6	0	2	3
Soldier	2	8	11	12	7	15	9	19	12	13

Note: The following N's were reported for the above groups:

A=100, B=60, C=52, D=50.

The second question asks if the subject has ever wondered why only men are called to the priesthood; then six reasons are given with instructions to underline the one which seems to be the best. Subjects were given the option of writing out any reason they considered better than the six mentioned, though only a few girls did so. The results are summarized in table 7. The authors note that the opinions are almost evenly divided between theological-institutional reasons (b,d,f) and psychological reasons (a,c,e), with the exception that the girls in the first group tended to choose the psychological reasons much more often. The authors note that the psychological motives tend to

OPINIONS OF BELGIAN GIRLS ABOUT WHY ONLY MEN ARE PRIESTS

(From the study of four Belgian nuns, 1957)

Category of Response	Group A (N=100)	Group B (N=80)	Group C (N=52)	Group D (N=56)
Per cent who have wondered why	87	62	81	60
Per cent who have not wondered why	13	38	19	40
<u>Per Cent Underlining as Best Reason:</u>				
Because certain features in a woman's character would be unsuitable in a priest	44	15	25	25
Because the first consecration, at the Last Supper, was made by a man (Jesus Christ)	20	36	30	33
Because man has authority over woman, not the contrary	18	10	14	12
Because the victim offered at the sacrifice of the Mass (as on the Cross) is a man (Jesus Christ)	4	6	15	16
Because women are readily indiscreet	10	11	2	6
Because, if it had been possible, Our Lady would have been a priest	4	12	14	8

increase slightly with age. They also point out that there is a great division of opinion in the girls concerning the significance of masculine characteristics. Thus, the girls were also asked to cross out the most unlikely reason why only men are called to the priesthood; of all 282 girls replying, 35% rejected the so-called lack of discretion (reason e) and 30% the authority of man

over woman (reason c). These figures (which are the only ones given by the authors for this part of the question) are contrasted with those showing that a great many girls chose psychological reasons (especially a and e) as the best.

The third question asks if the girls ever wondered why Catholic priests in their country cannot marry; then six reasons are given with instructions to underline the one they consider best. Subjects were given the option of writing in any reason they considered better than the six mentioned; of the few who did so, most only amplified one of the six reasons suggested. The results as reported are summarized in table 3. They show that distinctly religious reasons are greatly preferred, with little value being attached to psychological reasons. The authors add that selection of the last reason, belonging more completely to God, occurs more frequently as the age of the girls increase.

The next three questions dealt with the virtues and failings of priests. Thus, the fourth question listed six alternatives after asking:

"If you had to give one single counsel to a priest appointed to be chaplain to a group of young girls, which would be your primary choice?"

The girls were given the option of writing in any other advice they would like to give such a priest, but no reference is made to such answers in the discussion. Table 9 summarizes the results as reported. The authors note that the need for truth is far ahead of the others. They add that within group B, 36% of the 14-15 year olds selected "Do not judge their conduct too severely!", whereas 65% of the 19-20 year olds in group B preferred "Do not be afraid to tell them home truths!" The authors also note that whereas 16% of the entire 282 girls preferred "Do not talk too often about a religious vocation!", almost as many girls reject it as not to be given (11% in group A, 25% in B,

Table 8

31

OPINIONS OF BELGIAN GIRLS ABOUT WHY PRIESTS CANNOT MARRY

(From the study of four Belgian nuns, 1957)

Category of Response	Group A (N=100)	Group B (N=80)	Group C (N=52)	Group D (N=50)
Per cent who have wondered why	80	70	71	56
Per cent who have not wondered why	20	30	29	44
<u>Per Cent Underlining as Best Reason:</u>				
So that they may speak more authoritatively about the 6th and 9th commandments	0	7	2	4
Because Jesus Christ was not married	1	7	4	0
So that they may be freer to devote themselves to their apostolate	54	31	38	30
So that, by this privation of human love, they may resemble more Christ crucified	8	15	19	25
So that people will have confidence more readily in the absolute secret of the confessional	3	3	4	3
So that they may belong more completely to God	34	37	33	38

19% in C, and 24% in D).

The fifth question asks the girls to number (or rank) ten qualities or virtues in the order in which they prefer them in priests. The results are reported in the form of the "Place Order" of each quality. These "place order" ranks (apparently the ranks of the mean ranks) are given in table 10. The

PERCENTAGES OF BELGIAN GIRLS SELECTING ONE OF SIX ALTERNATIVES

AS THE BEST COUNSEL TO GIVE TO A CHAPLAIN FOR YOUNG GIRLS

(From the study of four Belgian nuns, 1957)

Type of Counsel	Per Cent Selecting It As Best From Group:			
	A (N=100)	B (N=80)	C (N=52)	D (N=50)
Do not frighten them!	6	10	15	5
Do not be too familiar with them!	9	7	9	6
Do not judge their conduct too severely!	6	20	11	17
Do not be afraid to tell them home truths!	45	42	44	44
Do not try to make them come to you for confession!	16	6	6	11
Do not talk too often about a religious vocation!	18	15	15	17

authors comment that three qualities seem to be unanimously appreciated: understanding, sincerity and will power. At the same time, there is great agreement about the three qualities least preferred: Politeness, abnegation regarding comfort, and respect for people. The authors speculate that girls project onto priests those values most dear to themselves, which represent their own highest moral and spiritual ambitions.

The sixth question reported asked the girls to select the principal one of seven reasons why many young Belgian girls stop practicing their religion after

**TEN QUALITIES OR VIRTUES AND THE ORDER IN WHICH
BELGIAN GIRLS PREFER THEM IN PRIESTS**

(From the study of four Belgian nuns, 1957)

Quality or Virtue	Rank of Mean Rank Assigned By Group:			
	A (N=100)	B (N=80)	C (N=52)	D (N=50)
Will power	3	3	3	4
Politeness	10	10	10	10
Understanding	1	2	1	1
Zeal	7	9	6	6
Humility	6	5	7	5
Sincerity	2	1	2	2
Hope in God	5	4	5	3
Respect for people	8	6	8	8
Abnegation regarding comfort	9	7	9	7
Intelligence	4	8	4	9

being brought up as Christians. The results as reported are summarized in table 11. The authors note that the girls only rarely impute the responsibility to priests, and that the failure to attribute any responsibility to political priests is a finding radically different from what would be found from boys.

The last three questions dealt with the general topic: "Attitudes about

PERCENTAGE OF BELGIAN GIRLS SELECTING ONE OF SEVEN ALTERNATIVES AS THE
PRINCIPAL REASON WHY CHRISTIAN GIRLS STOP PRACTICING THEIR RELIGION

(From the study of four Belgian nuns, 1937)

Why Girls Stop Practicing their Religion	Per Cent Selecting It as the Principal Reason from Group:			
	A (N=100)	B (N=80)	C (N=52)	D (N=50)
Because they have too much work to do	2	4	3	2
Because a priest has offended them	7	7	10	4
Because of their husband's influence	14	35	19	22
Because some priests are engaged in politics	0	8	0	0
Because of the Church's moral demands about marriage	13	6	14	14
Because of some priests' misbehavior	7	4	12	4
Because their religious instruction was insufficient	57	36	42	54

Priests". Thus question seven asked the girls if they would like their son to be a priest in the event they married, and why. The results are summarized in table 12. The authors note that 21% of all 202 girls answered no, and of these girls only 23% had a priest among their relatives. Of the remaining 79% of the total group, 40% had a priest in the family. The authors add that within the four sub-groups, 8 to 14% of those girls answering yes gave selfish or egocentric reasons why, such as: respectability, it being an honor for the family, or proof that the son received a good education.

REPLIES OF BELGIAN GIRLS TO THE QUESTION OF WHETHER
THEY WOULD WANT THEIR SON TO BE A PRIEST

(From the study of four Belgian nuns, 1957)

Answer	Per Cent Answering from Group:			
	A (N=100)	B (N=80)	C (N=52)	D (N=50)
Yes	75	68	81	73
Yes if have several children ^a	11	4	5	5
No	14	28	14	22

^a This category was not included in the questionnaire, but was derived from spontaneous qualifications.

The eighth question asked the girls reads as follows:

"While Anne (16 years old) was in boarding school, her parents were introduced to a cultured and agreeable priest whom they often invite to their home. During the holidays Anne, although she admires this priest, always finds a pretext to slip away as soon as he arrives.

"Do you understand Anne's attitude? How do you explain it?"

The results were reported in the form of percentages of girls from each group (a) who said they did understand Anne's attitude, and (b) the most frequent explanations made on the basis of the experimenters' classification of the essay type responses given by the girls. Table 13 gives these percentages. The authors expressed surprise over how often some kind of affective explanation was offered by the girls, and took this as an indication that it is difficult

PERCENTAGES OF BELGIAN GIRLS GIVING POSSIBLE EXPLANATION FOR AVOIDANCE
OF A PRIEST BY A HYPOTHETICAL 16 YEAR OLD GIRL

(Adapted from the study of four Belgian nuns, 1957)

Response or Explanation Given	Per Cent of Girls Giving Each Response from Group:			
	A (N=100)	B (N=80)	C (N=52)	D (N=50)
Understand and can explain girl's behavior	96	94	90	95
Behavior due to: ^a				
Shyness	25	22	1	12
Affective relationship with priest ^b	18	20	22	21
Something on her conscience ^c	18	8	14	18
Conversation being too solemn	6	9	6	14
Fear of pressure on vocation	4	3	-	4

^a Only those explanations which occurred most frequently and could be classified into definite categories were included in the table.

^b Only responses which clearly belonged in this category were reported; ambiguous responses were not included.

^c This response was given more frequently by older girls, whereas the younger girls gave "shyness" more often, the authors noted.

**REACTIONS OF BELGIAN GIRLS TO POSSIBILITY OF RECEIVING
ABSOLUTION FROM A PRIEST IN STATE OF MORTAL SIN**

(Adapted from the study of four Belgian nuns, 1957)

Response	Per Cent of Girls Giving Each Response from Group:			
	A (N=100)	B (N=80)	C (N=52)	D (N=50)
Indifferent	38	49	39	50
Question Validity of the absolution	27	21	20	19
Not indifferent for other reasons	35	30	41	31
Not indifferent for "entirely correct" reasons ^a	29	5	8	11

^a "Entirely correct" replies represent a subcategory of the more general category "Not indifferent for other reasons".

for a priest to maintain pastoral relationships with young girls which are "free from any subtle contamination".

The ninth question asked the girls:

"Why would you prefer not to receive absolution from a priest in a state of mortal sin? Or is this indifferent to you?"

The answers were categorized in four ways by the authors, and the percentages of girls from each group whose answers fell into each category are given in table 11.

REACTIONS OF BELGIAN GIRLS TO ADVICE THAT A YOUNG GIRL
WITH AN EMBARRASSING PROBLEM GO TO A PRIEST

(Adapted from study of the four Belgian nuns, 1957)

Response	Per Cent of Girls Giving Each Response from Group:			
	A (N=100)	B (N=80)	C (N=52)	D (N=50)
Entirely agree with advice	67	85	68	76
Categorically disagree	22	13	7	15
Distinguish between certain types of situation	11	2	25	9

The tenth and last question reported reads:

"Angela is a very thoughtful young girl. She is in an embarrassing position and confides in her friend Catherine. The latter advises her not to think about it so much, but to go to a certain priest who solves difficult problems.

"Do you agree with Catherine? What do you think about it?"

The results for this question were given in percentage form and are summarized in table 15. The authors note that there were two major reasons given by those who said Angela should not go: those who said she would not dare go and would "fight shy" of the idea, consisting primarily of younger girls; and those who said Angela should think it over more beforehand, consisting primarily of older girls. Of those girls who distinguished between certain situations, 80% were 17 years old; and the authors considered this response to be a product of a certain degree of maturity.

In their concluding remarks, the authors note that most of the girls gave correct and deeply Christian opinions about the priesthood, but that their attitudes toward the priest are marked by a kind of egocentrism and a sentimental approach which should be taken into consideration by Catholic educators. Especially noted were the high number of replies against wanting their son to be a priest, the many hesitations about the influence of a priest's moral state on the validity of absolution, and the extreme opinions in opposite directions about the desirability of going to a priest for help with personal problems. The authors urge that religious instructions for girls who continue their studies into higher levels should emphasize the sacramental function of the priest and the mediation which he exercises between God and Man, and the fact that such functions are not on a sentimental basis.

Evaluation of the Study of the Four Belgian Nuns

On the whole this study represents a very fine investigation into the topic in question, and the discussions of the results appear to be very accurate and appropriate. Many of the questions formulated represent creative efforts to get information about very worthwhile matters. The main shortcomings of the study were in the accuracy of the statistical reporting and the appropriateness of the statistical basis for comparing groups in their responses to the questions.

Preliminary to the reporting of results the authors note that Group A was composed of 100 girls, Group B of 80 girls, Group C of 52 girls, and Group D of 50 girls. From that point on there is never any mention of any N, creating the impression (reflected in tables 6 through 15 of this review) that the above N's apply to all the tables given in their report. This is all well and good

until one begins to examine closely the percentage figures reported for the groups in many of the tables. For example, if group D has an N of 50 throughout, then all percentages reported for group D should be even numbers; yet no less than 25 of the 67 percentage figures given for group D are odd numbers. This raises a serious question: are there inaccuracies in the statistics reported, or does the N for group D vary? If the latter is the correct explanation, then the experimenters should have reported the N's for every table given in their study. It should be noted, moreover, that this type of inconsistency is not limited to group D. Thus, if group C always had an N of 52, then 28 out of the 67 percentages reported were impossible to obtain or inaccurate.

The second statistical shortcoming has to do with the basis for the authors' evaluation of similarities and differences between the groups studied. These evaluations apparently were based solely on the percentage scores reported; no correlations or tests of significance were reported in this connection. Hence the authors were reporting group differences and similarities without using the best statistical tools available upon which to base such inferences.

Since the purpose of the survey of the four Belgian nuns was to find out the attitudes of adolescent girls toward the priesthood, it differs from the present study because group differences are not a very great concern. And while results are presented separately for the girls from each of the four schools which supplied the subjects, usually in percentage form, comparisons between subject groups are drawn from such percentages without further statistical tests of significance, as has been already noted. One close similarity to the present study is that the Belgian study dealt exclusively with opinions

about the priesthood. Finally, a very big difference is in the populations studied—Belgian girls as opposed to United States boys, half of whom intend to become priests.

The Loyola Study reported by Herr

This study consisted of giving the ten questions reported from the Belgian survey to a group of 150 high school girls in Chicago, and then comparing the results with those reported for the Belgian sample. The Chicago or American sample were of the middle and upper middle socio-economic classes, and fell within the same age range as the Belgian sample (14 to 20 years old). The American girls were always asked to rank all alternatives in the questions whereas the Belgians were asked to give only their first and last preferences, hence the Loyola study obtained more complete data in this respect. Herr's discussion of the Loyola study did not give a complete statistical report, however, but only those figures and computations which were necessary to give the reader an adequate basis for comparing the Belgian and American samples. In his discussion the results for the Belgian sample were combined in the form of a single median percentage score derived from the four percentage scores reported by the Belgian study for their four subgroups, so that the Belgian sample as a whole could be compared to the American sample. The differences in group responses to each question were computed using the Chi^2 technique. The Yates' correction for continuity was always used in these Chi^2 computations. All differences which had a Chi^2 probability of .05 or less were considered significant.

No significant differences were reported for the first question, which asked the girls to indicate which of six professions was nearest to the role of

the priest. According to Herr's figures, both samples selected doctor first (Belgians 69%; Americans 54%) and professor second (Belgians 12%; Americans 14%). The Belgian girls considered director least similar, whereas the American girls selected soldier and lawyer—a tie—as the least similar professions.

On the second question, asking for reasons why the girls thought only men are called to the priesthood, there were again no statistically significant differences. However, a tendency was noted for the Belgian girls to stress the unsuitableness of the woman's character, whereas the Americans stressed the character of Christ. Herr reports the following comparative results for a part of this question:

	Belgians	Americans
Because...a woman's character...unsuitable	25%	12%
Because the first consecration...was...by a man	32%	43%
Because the victim...of the Mass...is a man	11%	13%

The third question, asking for reasons why Catholic priests cannot marry, was answered in almost identical fashion by the two groups. Thus:

	Belgians	Americans
To be freer for their apostolate	35%	42%
To belong more completely to God	36%	36%
To more resemble Christ	17%	7%

The fourth question asked which of several counsels the girls would give to a priest appointed to be chaplain to a group of young girls, and the first significant difference was found here. The comparative percentages for three of the counsels were (with the one showing the significant difference marked by an asterisk):

	Belgians	Americans
"Do not be afraid to tell them home truths"	44%	21%*
"Don't talk too much about vocations"	16%	33%
"Do not judge their conduct too severely"	14%	14%

Significantly more Belgian girls responded to the first counsel listed; Herr suggests the reason probably is that the two groups attach different meanings to the term "home truths". Herr also notes that the older the American girls were, the less they selected this counsel. Just the opposite finding was noted in the study of the Belgian girls.

The fifth question asked the girls which of ten qualities they most preferred in a priest. Herr reports the following comparative ranks for the two samples:

	Belgians	Americans
Understanding	1	1
Sincerity	2	2
Will Power	3	5, 6 or 7
Hope in God	4	4
Humility	5, 6 or 7	3
Zeal	5, 6 or 7	10
Intelligence	5, 6 or 7	5, 6 or 7
Respect for people	8 or 9	8 or 9
Abnegation regarding comfort	8 or 9	8 or 9
Politeness	10	5, 6 or 7

(Herr reported the first four and last rank for each sample; and also gave the two next to the last qualities, which were the same for both groups.) No significant differences were reported between the Belgian and American groups.

The sixth question, asking the girls to select the best of seven reasons why Catholic girls cease to practice religion, showed two significant differences between the Belgian and American girls. Herr reports the following comparative percentages in answers given to the question (with significant differences marked by an asterisk after the last figure):

	Belgians	Americans
Insufficient religious instruction	48%	29% *
Church moral demands about marriage	13%	34% *
Influence of husband	21%	22%
Offended by a priest	8%	3%
Some priests are in politics	1%	0%
Some priests' misbehavior	5%	3%

The Belgian girls placed relatively more significance on religious instruction, whereas relatively more American girls consider the church's restraints on marriage as the most important factor listed leading to loss of faith in Catholic women. Herr notes that both samples attributed relatively little importance to the behavior of priests as a factor, as indicated by the low percentages given to the last three reasons listed on the previous page.

The seventh question, asking whether the girls would like their son to be a priest if they marry, showed no significant differences between the two samples from Brussels and Chicago. Thus the relative Yes and No answers reported by Herr were:

	Belgians	Americans
Yes	74%	78%
No	16%	13%

In both samples, Herr notes, girls who had relatives in the religious life or priesthood more frequently would want their sons to be priests, and to a significant degree.

The eighth question, about an adolescent girl home from boarding school who always slipped away when a priest friend of the family visited, showed one significant difference, namely, that 94% of the Belgian girls but only 57% of the Americans said they understood this behavior. Five per cent of the Belgians and 35% of the American girls said they did not understand. Herr reports that there were no differences between the two samples in the reasons given to explain the girl's behavior.

The ninth question asked whether or not the girls would be indifferent to receiving absolution from a priest in a state of mortal sin. For both samples, Herr reports, 45% answered "yes" and 35% answered "no". In the American as

well as the Belgian sample, Herr continues, about one-fifth of the girls displayed an ignorance of Catholic doctrine by answering they were not indifferent because they would consider the priest's absolution to be invalid.

The tenth and last question, about a girl in an embarrassing position whose friend advises her to go to a certain priest who solves difficult problems, showed no significant differences between the samples. Thus, the relative responses as to whether the girls agreed with the advice were:

	Belgians	Americans
Entirely agreed	72%	70%
Categorically disagreed	11%	4%
Distinguished certain types of situations	10%	25%

Herr notes that within both groups, most of the girls who distinguished different types of situations were age 17 years or older.

The overall finding suggested by the Loyola study is that Belgian and American girls, as represented by the Brussels and Chicago samples, have remarkably similar attitudes about the priesthood once allowances are made for differences about certain specifics. Commenting generally about the findings of the Belgian and Loyola studies, Herr notes that adolescents evaluate priests in a more emotional than logical fashion—possibly reflecting the emotional kinds of reaction which characterize their parents, and/or possibly expressing the immaturity and insecurity so notably present in adolescents. Herr concludes that both parents and adolescents could benefit from better instructions about the sacramental role of the priest, and also about the fact that most priests are trained to engage in counseling with their parishioners for the handling of day-to-day problems which occur in the natural process of growing up.

Evaluation of the Loyola Study

The Loyola study represents an improvement over all of the previously

reviewed studies in that it is the only one in which group comparisons are based on a statistical test of the significance of such group differences. It also makes a valuable contribution in comparing the attitudes of two different nationality groups of adolescent girls using the same set of questions.

The methods and purposes of the Loyola study are closest to the approach used in the current study. Thus, questionnaire items dealing with attitudes toward the priesthood were administered to different subject groups whose performances were compared on the basis of statistical tests of difference in the frequency of responses given to the questions by the groups. An important difference is that the current study compares groups of boys—half of whom are seminarians—whereas the Loyola study used only girls. Thus the groups used in the present study have no empirically demonstrated similarity to the groups used in the Belgian and Loyola studies. (A pilot study with a Chicago sample by Kerr suggests few sex differences, however.) Finally, the present study did not use the same questions as the Belgian and Loyola studies, though some borrowing and imitation did occur as will be seen in the next chapter.

Questions Asked Parishioners by Fichter and Schuyler

In his study of a northern United States midwestern parish, Fichter (1954) asked 245 white Catholic lay leaders from several urban parishes:

"When it is not a matter of faith and morals, what is the best position for the parish priest to take in the parochial organizations?" (Fichter, 1954, p. 36)

Fichter explains that the criterion for leadership was holding office in one of the parish societies, and that all the persons questioned were over 25 years of age. The results he reported are found in table 16. It should be noted that the four alternatives or choices were given in the questionnaire, hence

**CATHOLIC LEADERS' OPINIONS ABOUT THE TYPES OF LEADERSHIP THE PRIEST SHOULD
TAKE IN PARISH ORGANIZATIONS ON MATTERS NOT INVOLVING FAITH AND MORALS**

(Fichter, 1954, Table 7, p. 36)

Alternative	Selected as Best By:					
	Males		Females		Both	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Complete control (by priest)	11	7.5	2	2.0	13	5.3
Power of final decision only	35	23.8	7	7.2	42	17.1
Advice and direction only	91	61.9	84	85.7	175	71.5
Equal vote with parishioners	10	6.8	5	5.1	15	6.1
Totals	147	100.0	98	100.0	245	100.0

it was a multiple-choice rather than essay question. Fichter's results show that the parish leaders prefer the priest to maintain a moderate position as opposed to the extremes of great control or minimum influence.

Schuyler (1960, chapter 8), in his study of a parish in New York City, sent a questionnaire to be filled out by parishioners who expressed a willingness to answer it. Of the questions whose results he reported, four appear pertinent to the topic of this thesis. In his study, Schuyler did a complete census of the territory covered by the parish he studied. According to his figures, there were 3,520 families in the territory at the time of the study. Of those, 753 could not be contacted in the census (about 9%); and 4,674

families had at least one Catholic member. Of these 4,674 families there were 3,674 belonging to the parish and 1,000 belonging to a national church in the area. Every one of the 3,674 Catholic families belonging to the parish was asked to fill out and return a census form; and 2,704 families (73.6%) did so representing 3,371 persons including 216 non-Catholics. Every family sent a census form was also sent a card asking them to indicate if they would be willing to answer a special questionnaire for the researcher. More than 1,000 persons agreed to respond, and 293 actually did so. These 293 persons thus represented almost 30% of the pledges and over 10% of all the parish families which had cooperated with the census. On the basis of demographic considerations they were seen by Schuyler as a good representative sample of the parishioners, this being further insured by the fact that only one was distributed to any one family. There were 144 men (49%) and 149 women (51%) as compared to an overall parish ratio of 46% males and 54% females. They were seen as above the parish average educationally and in general religious observance.

In the first of the questions to be considered here, Schuyler asked about the parishioners' understanding of how much time is available to their priests; they were to check one of four statements which in their opinion best described the situation. Of the 250 who answered, 221 believed that the priest in a large parish has so many activities that he might be otherwise occupied when someone calls the rectory, 25 believed that a priest always has something to do but is never really hard-pressed for time, and four believed a priest has little to do beyond his day of duty.

Another question asked if the parishioners ever greet a priest in the street. Of the 293 who answered this question, 287 said they do, 80 of whom

do so only if they know the priest. The 237 were asked in multiple-choice form to check the reason why they greet the priest: "Because he represents Christ to me and through him I greet Christ" was checked by 189 persons; out of habit was checked by 56; because of the priest's social position in the community was checked by 27; and "for various other reasons" was checked by 15 persons.

A very interesting question was one which asked the parishioners to estimate the relative importance of various roles carried on by the priest. Eleven roles were listed and they were asked to write 1, 2 and 3 after the three most important duties and x, y and z after the three least important duties. The results are summarized in table 17. It should be noted that Schuyler's question did not make explicit mention of ordering the assignment of numbers or letters to the roles listed, hence it could not be stated for sure whether the role lettered "x" or that lettered "z" was the one seen as least important. This apparently was why Schuyler usually seemed to consider the total times a role was numbered or lettered to be more important than which number or letter was assigned most frequently (the main exception to this seemed to be involved in placing liturgical leader ahead of educational leader). Father Schuyler expressed the opinion that the terms "mediator" and "liturgical leader" were not understood adequately by the respondents, and that those two roles would have been rated higher if more elaborate, understandable phrases had been used to convey their meaning. Thus he suggested "offeror of men's prayer to God and dispenser of God's grace to men" and "leader of divine worship".

The last of Schuyler's questions to be reviewed here asked: "Should today's priest spend his time mostly in being priest to the faithful or in being prophet and teacher to those without the faith?" Of those persons responding,

**NEW YORK CITY PARISHIONERS' ESTIMATES OF THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE
OF ELEVEN DUTIES CARRIED ON BY THE PRIEST**

(From Schuyler, 1960, Table X, p. 175)

<u>Duty or Role</u> (Given in order of Estimated Importance)	<u>Numbers of Parishioners Who:</u>							
	Numbered Role As Most Important				Lettered Role As Least Important			
	1	2	3	Total	x	y	z	Total
Preacher and teacher of God's word	209	59	8	276	0	0	0	0
Counselor	2	80	78	160	4	4	8	16
Father	60	37	23	120	8	3	3	14
Liturgical leader	6	41	36	83	6	11	13	30
Educational leader	5	24	48	77	3	6	8	17
Mediator	7	11	29	47	11	9	12	32
Administrator	4	12	15	31	17	20	16	53
Reformer	11	10	21	42	33	36	34	103
Recreational leader	1	5	7	13	53	55	42	150
Social leader	1	0	8	9	46	39	67	152
Civic leader	1	1	4	6	72	65	37	174
Totals	307	280	277	864	253	248	240	741

30 said there could be no either-or answer to the question, and several more said they couldn't answer the question; 130 or "nearly half of those who expressed an opinion" said the priest should be mostly concerned with the faithful; and an unreported number of persons said the priest should be mostly concerned with those not having the faith. Schuyler had all his respondents divided into four different grades with respect to their (a) religious observance, (b) economic status, and (c) general and Catholic educational level. Of the 130 persons who answered that the priest should be mostly concerned with the faithful, there were represented: (a) 20 of all 33 respondents categorized as showing outstanding religious performance, but less than 50% of the persons falling in all three lower categories of religious observance; (b) 10 of all 13 respondents who were in the highest income group (\$10,000 a year or more), but less than half of all respondents in the lower income categories; and (c) just over 60% of all respondents who had at least some college education, but less than 50% of respondents whose highest educational level was high school or less. Apparently Schuyler was suggesting a trend for persons manifesting outstanding religious observance, having high economic status, or possessing some college education to attach relatively greater importance to the priest spending his time mostly with the faithful as opposed to devoting it mostly to those without the faith.

Schuyler also asked many other questions of his parishioners which are not pertinent to this study. They dealt with such matters as how well the respondents appeared to understand certain Church teachings, and how they applied them to certain specific social or personal problems. Questions on these latter topics were parallel to those asked by Fichter as part of his study of a southern

urban parish (Fichter, 1951, chapter 20.)

Lhota's Study

This study and the one that follows it by Bier are of interest here because they compared seminarians with non-seminarians. Lhota's (1948) did so with respect to vocational interest patterns, and Bier's (1948) with respect to personality traits having significance regarding emotional healthiness. In neither instance was the main focus of this thesis, namely their opinions or attitudes about the priesthood, touched upon.

Lhota (1948) developed a clerical scale on the Strong Interest Blank for Men based on the interests of priests as contrasted with Strong's clerical interest scale based on results obtained from Protestant clergymen. Lhota used a normative group of 262 priests from 35 different states to develop his clerical interest stencil through the application of Strong's statistical methods to the data this group provided.

These priests had a mean age of 38.9 years and a minimum formal education of 20 grades. Lhota reports that 73% of the Strong items showed significant differentiation between these priests and Strong's men-in-general. The reliability coefficient on this scale for the priest group was 0.925 using the split-half method.

To investigate the validity of the scale he then administered Strong Interest Blanks to 208 diocesan theological students from four seminaries located in the eastern states. Most of the students came from 17 eastern states, and only nine from west of the Mississippi representing three western states. For the 195 students whose ages were given, there was a mean age of approximately 24 years with a range of 21 to 34 years. All had completed at least 13 grades

of schooling. The theological students obtained a mean raw score of 92.03 on Ithota's clerical interest scale, with a standard deviation of 54.13; this is compared to the mean score of 106.50 and sigma of 55.72 obtained by the priests. When these means were converted to standard scores the difference was found to be 2.73 standard scores and hence was significant at the one per cent level of confidence. (A critical ratio of 2.23 was obtained.) Ithota still considered the closeness of the results obtained from the two groups to be an indication that the validity was affirmed by this cross-validation study. He also presented a table showing that the theological student group, like the group of priests, showed a high percentage of individuals who were rated as probably possessing clerical interests or higher. These figures are given in table 13.

Ithota then compared the interests of his group of priests with those of 33 other occupational groups. He found the highest correlations with the Protestant ministers (.8472) and social science teachers (.7839), the lowest with engineers (-.1623) and presidents of manufacturing companies (-.1451). Other occupational groups showing high correlations were Y.M.C.A. physical directors (.7197), city school superintendents (.6234), Y.M.C.A. secretary (.6170), personnel director (.6108), and musician (.5486). Those showing moderately high correlations were math-science teacher (.3642), office manager (.3610), life insurance salesman (.3608), policeman (.3599), psychologist (.2780) and accountant (.2318). Others showing negative correlations were farmer (-.0194), mathematician (-.1072), and purchasing agent (-.1254). The remaining 15 occupational categories showed fairly low positive correlations of from .0411 for production manager to .1602 for advertising man. The priest group was found to belong to Strong's general vocational group five, labeled "welfare" or

PERCENTAGES OF PRIESTS AND THEOLOGY STUDENTS WHO OBTAINED
VARIOUS RATINGS ON LHOTA'S CLERICAL INTEREST SCALE

(Adapted from Lhota, 1948, Table 9, p. 15)

Rating	Rating Description	Per Cent Obtaining Rating In:	
		Priest's Group (N=262)	Theology Student's Group (N=208)
A	Certainly possessed	71	60
B+	Most probably possessed	15	19
B	Probably possessed	6	11
B-	Less probably possessed	7	7
C+	Certainly not possessed	0	1
C	Certainly not possessed	2	2

"social-uplift" by other authors (r of .7056); this included the six individual occupational categories which correlated most highly with the group. The only other noteworthy positive correlations between Lhota's clerical scale and general vocational groups was .3104 with Strong's group 10 (advertising men, lawyers, author-journalists) and .2619 with Strong's group 9 (sales managers, realtors, life insurance salesmen).

Lhota then administered the Strong Interest Blank for men to 90 fourth year minor seminarians, 100 first year minor seminarians, 72 Catholic high school freshmen and 61 Catholic high school seniors. The seminarians came from four different seminaries, three located in the East and one in the West. The

PERCENTAGES OF BOYS FALLING INTO STRONG'S INTEREST

CATEGORIES ON LHOTA'S CLERICAL INTEREST SCALE

(Adapted from Lhota, 1948, Tables 15, 17 and 19, p. 28-29)

Group	Per Cent Falling into Rating Category:					
	A	B+	B	B-	C+	C
First year seminarians (N=100)	26	21	25	8	6	12
Fourth year seminarians (N=90)	45	21	12	10	8	5
High school freshmen (N=72)	1	10	11	14	11	53
High school seniors (N=61)	5	4	10	11	17	53

fourth year group ranged in age from 16 to 20 years (for 13 it was not known) with a modal age of 17; the first year group ranged from 12 to 19 years (not known for 10) with the modal age being 14. Age information was not reported for the non-seminarian groups. Table 19 gives a summary of the results obtained with these four groups.

Lhota took these results to show that his clerical scale can be used to help vocational counselors determine whether first and fourth year seminarians do or do not possess definite clerical interests, i.e. interests which are characteristic of the average diocesan priest. On the other hand very few Catholic high school students manifested definite clerical interests, and a high percentage were shown to be definitely lacking in clerical interests. Lhota concludes that the scale should be valuable for use in helping to evaluate applicants to minor seminaries, and that his results suggest that the majority of minor

seminarians—at least in the seminaries studied—are preparing for a vocation which is in harmony with their measured interests. In a following chapter he discusses limitations which should be kept in mind in order to make effective use of the clerical scale.

Bier's Study

Bier (1948) undertook a study comparing seminary students to medical, dental, law and college students with respect to their performance on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (hereafter referred to as the MMPI). His study was an attempt to learn something about the psychological factors which characterize satisfactory adjustment in major seminarians, hence his results have only an indirect bearing on the purposes of the present thesis.

The MMPI was administered to 188 seminarians, and the tests of 171 were used in the study after 17 were dropped—three for failure to meet the norms on one or more of the validity scales, four for failure to indicate their age, and ten because they were minor seminarians. There were 264 MMPI's given to medical students and 208 used; 206 to dental students and 121 used; 162 to law students and 55 used; and 464 to college students of which 369 were used. Reasons for not using the tests of the latter four groups included: 216 dropped for being non-Catholics, 90 for being married, 31 for failure to meet the norms of one or more validity scales, and six for failure to indicate their age. It was considered advisable to use only the records of unmarried Catholic students in each group so that they would be as nearly alike as possible to the seminarian group apart from their difference in vocation. The data were collected during World War II and hence this had some effect on the composition of some of the groups, most notably the law and college students. Only small numbers of law students

were available because many who would have pursued such schooling were drafted and in the armed forces. The same was true with respect to third and fourth year college students. In contrast members of the remaining three groups were allowed to pursue their studies with relatively few exceptions, Bier noted.

In reporting the overall results of the subject groups' performance on the nine MMPI clinical scales (hypochondriasis or Hs, depression or D, hysteria or Hy, psychopathic deviate or Pd, masculinity-femininity or Mf, paranoia or Pa, psychasthenia or Pt, schizophrenia or Sc, and hypomania or Ma), Bier noted a definite trend toward obtaining scores higher than the population-at-large. The subject groups studied obtained mean T scores above 50 (which is average) 89% of the time on the nine MMPI clinical scales; and the number of T scores above 70 and therefore "abnormal" were more than twice what should be expected from the population-at-large on the basis of the test norms.

Moreover, this trend was most extreme for the seminarian group. Thus using mean T scores adjusted for age, the medical students obtained lower T scores than the seminarians on six of the nine MMPI scales (Hs, D, Hy, Mf, Pa and Pt). On all nine scales the differences between the seminarians and medical students were statistically significant to at least the five per cent level of confidence; the t test was used to determine the significance of mean T score differences between the groups. The dental students obtained significantly lower mean T scores than the seminarians on seven scales; of the two on which the seminarians were lower, one was statistically significant (Ma) and one was not (Pd). On the other hand, the law students had mean T scores higher than the seminarians on five scales (Hs, D, Hy, Pd and Ma) with only one difference being statistically significant (on Ma); of the remaining four favoring the law

students (i.e. they obtained T scores lower than the seminarians), one showed a statistically significant difference (MF). The college students obtained lower T scores than the seminarians on five scales (Hy, MF, Pa, Pt and Sc) with only one being statistically significant (on MF); none of the four differences favoring the seminarians was statistically significant.

The seminarians also had the highest percentage of "abnormal scales" of any of the groups, an abnormal scale being one on which an individual subject obtained a T score of 70 or above. Thus 40% of the seminarians had at least one abnormal scale; the law students were next with almost 33%, and all three other groups had under 30%. So from analyzing the groups' T scores on the clinical scales of the MMPI, Bier concluded that the seminarians as a group had scores indicating poorer adjustment than the other groups studied, which in turn had scores indicating deviation from the population-in-general in the direction of poorer adjustment.

Bier then took the subjects in each student group who represented the best adjusted and worst adjusted extremes. He did this by summing the T scores of all nine clinical scales for each subject; then he took the 27% who had the highest T score sums as being the most poorly adjusted members of their group, and the 27% who had the lowest T score sums as being the best adjusted members.

Bier then compared these subgroups with one another and in various combinations. He found that among the well-adjusted segments of the groups, and also among the poorly adjusted segments, that there were fewer significant differences than among the total groups. Taking the five per cent level of confidence as the minimum for significance, there were 41 out of 98 possible significant inter-group differences among the total groups (or 46%), 35 significant

inter-group differences among the poorly adjusted segments (or 39%), and 32 significant differences among the best adjusted segments (or 36%). If the one per cent level of confidence is used as the criterion for significance, these inter-group difference figures became 29 (or 32%) for the total groups' comparisons, 21 (or 23%) for the best adjusted segments, and 19 (or 21%) for the poorly adjusted segments.

Dier took this as evidence that each of the extreme segments of the groups studied form more homogeneous populations than do the entire groups. He goes on to cite evidence which suggests that the best adjusted segment is more homogeneous than the poorly adjusted segment. Thus the best adjusted segment had smaller standard deviations on all nine MMPI clinical scales than did the total population, whereas the poorly adjusted segment had smaller sigmas than the total population on only three of these nine scales.

Dier takes the above evidence as an indication that adjustment, in terms of being either good or bad, is something which cuts across vocational or occupational lines. To further support this hypothesis, he notes that inter-group differences within both the best and the poorly adjusted segments of all the groups taken by themselves, are far fewer than differences between the best and poorly adjusted segments of each student group within itself. Thus well-adjusted seminarians differed far more from poorly adjusted seminarians than they did from the well-adjusted segments of the other student groups. So Dier concludes that good personality adjustment means to a large extent the same thing in seminarians as it does in the other student groups studied. He further concludes that his evidence indicates that the norms of personality adjustment or mental health established for the population at large can be

applied to seminarians. Presumably he is speaking of the norms as represented by MMPI, for he adds:

"The MMPI will serve as a substantially suitable instrument in the testing of seminary adjustment because it is accomplishing essentially the same thing, giving essentially the same differentiation in the seminary group as it is in the others." (Bier, 1948, p.50)

He recalls that the inter-group differences which attained statistical significance at the one per cent level of confidence represented about one-third of all possible differences for the total groups' comparisons. He goes on:

"This may be taken as a general index of the amount of agreement and divergence in the general adjustment picture as presented by the various groups. On this basis we can say that for the population of the present study the over-all agreement in adjustment is two thirds or slightly better; the divergence, one third or less. Because the agreement is two thirds or better we consider the adjustment picture as presented by the different groups as substantially the same." (Bier, 1948, p. 50-51)

Bier adds that serious consideration also has to be given to the fact that nearly a third of such differences were significant at the one per cent level, which led him to do an item analysis of the inter-group differences. The outcome of this item analysis was the conclusion that:

"A consideration of the verbal content of the items which serve to differentiate the seminary group from the other groups creates the presumption that these are very largely items which do not apply to the seminarian in his way of life, or else they had a meaning for the seminary group very different from the meaning they hold for the other groups. It appears, therefore, to be the changed significance of these items for the seminary group which very largely account for the observed differences." (Bier, 1948, p. 88)

Finally, Bier urged that the test be modified for usage with seminarians by eliminating such items so long as they were shown empirically to be undiagnostic, that is, so long as they yielded no significant differentiation between the well and poorly adjusted seminarian subgroups.

Evaluation of Bier's Study

The first part of the study gives a very informative and useful summary of how the seminarians scored on the various MMPI scales when contrasted with comparable student groups. It appears to be a very worthwhile contribution to our knowledge.

The second part of the study, however, in which comparisons were made using extreme segments of each group studied, raises several problems, and many of the conclusions drawn are of doubtful value. To start with, Bier gave evidence to show that the extreme segments of the groups formed a more homogeneous population than did the groups as a whole. Part of this evidence consisted of the fact that the extreme segments had fewer significant inter-group differences; yet the differences in proportions of significant versus non-significant T score differences (e.g. 29, as opposed to 21 or 19 significant differences out of 90 comparisons) are far from significant in any instance when put into a 2x2 table and subjected to a χ^2 test. The other evidence cited to demonstrate this greater homogeneity, namely, the lower sigmas of the best adjusted segment, can also be questioned on the basis of the nature of the MMPI T score distributions. Thus, the T score distributions are generally positively skewed, and it is possible for more variability to occur at the higher T score extremes than at the lower extremes. This seems to be supported by the fact that the poorly adjusted subgroups had larger sigmas than the total group on six of the nine scales.

Then Bier draws a two-fold conclusion that is difficult to see as following from his evidence. The first is that good adjustment is much the same for seminarians as for the other groups, and the second is that the MMPI is a

suitable instrument for assessing good and bad adjustment in seminarians because it accomplishes the same thing with them as it does with the other groups. As support for this, he notes that the well-adjusted seminarians showed fewer differences from the other well-adjusted subgroups than from poorly adjusted seminarians. But this is circular reasoning: using the MMPI scores to differentiate two extreme sets of subgroups, he then shows how different they are from one another on their MMPI scores, and concludes that the MMPI does a good job of differentiating. It seems to me the main thing proved is that when you differentiate groups of scores into extremes, they stay that way. In another words, the scores of people who score low on the MMPI are more like the scores of other people who score low than like the scores of other people who score high; and this is true regardless of the vocational pursuits of the high and low scorers, who can both be found in all the vocational groups studied by Mier. But this does not mean that the low scorers in each vocational group are equally well adjusted, even though their scores be the same. The only way they can be shown to be alike from Mier's data is in their MMPI scores. He presents no direct evidence to show that those seminarians who scored lower are better adjusted than those seminarians who scored higher. The fact that the distribution of T scores made by the seminary group was similar to the distributions of T scores made by the other groups is at best only presumptive evidence that the MMPI has validity for application to seminarians; and this evidence is far from compelling, especially in view of the outcome of his item analysis. Moreover, his point that there is two-thirds agreement between the seminarian and other total groups is open to question; thus he uses the one per cent level of confidence as his criterion for individual scale differences, but the figure goes

from two-thirds to 54% agreement if the five per cent level of confidence is used. When there are differences 46% of the time which are significant at at least the five per cent level of confidence, then there does not appear to be a convincing overall agreement in scores between the groups—unless it might be on some other basis. And again, even if an agreement in score distributions can be assumed, it does not automatically follow that there is agreement in adjustmental level between the groups obtaining the scores. The question of validity (except perhaps for "face validity") cannot be answered adequately without comparing the MMPI scores of the seminarians with other criteria drawn from their behavior which can be assumed to reflect their adjustment.

The concluding part of Dier's study, the item analysis, is a very worthwhile effort to pin down qualities in the test which may tend to make it discriminate unfairly against seminarians in its assessment of their adjustment. For students of the MMPI, it is a helpful discussion for getting ideas about how members of any special vocational or other social group might be prone to score high on one or more parts of the test because of factors which may not be primarily adjustmental in nature.

Murray's Article

Murray's report includes a discussion of a research study he did as well as summaries of other related studies. He administered the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (G-Z), the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank to the following groups of subjects: 100 priests, 100 major seminarians, 100 minor seminarians, and 200 college men taking a college psychology course. The former three groups were each subdivided equally among diocesan and religious community members.

On the personality tests the priests and both seminarian groups of Murray's sample generally compared favorably with his sample of college men, which in turn was found to be a "sound normal group". The college group actually was significantly inferior to all the others on both the Friendliness and the Good Personal Relations scales of the G-Z. Also, the priests had the most favorable scores on the Emotional Maturity Scale of the G-Z. These results still held after the influence of age was taken into account.

Murray found that according to the Masculinity-Femininity scale of the G-Z, the priest and major seminarian groups both showed "easily normal" interests and actually were more "masculine" than the college group. He notes that the G-Z Masculinity-Femininity scale was developed for use with college men and women, hence is more appropriate for his sample than most such scales developed in other personality tests. Masculinity-Femininity scales used in many personality tests tend to show an increase in femininity in college men because they do not make allowance for the fact that college men and women share a more common cultural background and set of interests, Murray explains.

On the Strong test Murray compared the college group to all of the other groups regarding their scores on both the old clerical scale developed by Strong on the basis of the interests of Ministers, and also on the new Clerical scale based on the interests of diocesan clergy developed by Lhota (1948). Murray's results duplicated Lhota's finding that the old clerical scale did not differentiate priests nor priesthood candidates adequately. On Lhota's new Clerical scale, however, the seminarians and priests clearly scored higher than the college group. Murray gives comparative scores on Lhota's clerical scale between his college men and all the other groups, and this information is given in

SCORES OF COLLEGIANS COMPARED WITH SCORES OF PRIESTS AND SEMINARIANS ON
LHOTA'S CLERICAL SCALE OF THE STRONG VOCATIONAL INTEREST BLANK

(Adapted from Murray, 1959)

Group	Mean	Amount Mean Score Is Above Collegian Mean
Collegians (N=100)	35.68	-----
Minor Diocesan seminarians (N=50)	42.87	7.19
Minor Religious seminarians (N=50)	41.02	5.34
Major Diocesan seminarians (N=50)	41.87	6.19
Major Religious seminarians (N=50)	47.36	11.68
Diocesan priests (N=50)	44.84	9.16
Religious priests (N=50)	43.05	7.37

table 20. It clearly demonstrates group differences, though in this article Murray gave no data concerning the tests of statistical significance he used. Also, the group N's in his table do not match those mentioned in the body of his article and this is not explained.

Murray then mentions other related research, including that Fr. Paul Marcy at Catholic University has developed another Strong scale proper to the Maryknoll Missionary Community, and also that there has been much research done by Fr. William Hier, S.J. and others at Fordham University on the applicability of the MSPI to seminarians, priests and other religious groups.

Finally, Murray discusses the possible value which psychological tests, such as those used in his study, might have in the very important work of identifying vocations and of trying to reduce the high ratio of students who leave the seminary between high school entrance and ordination, which one study at Catholic University calculated at 83%. Murray urges more research aimed at identifying positive indications of the existence of a vocation, and not just at finding indications of unfitness for the religious life. He notes that so far the Lhota scale is the best such positive tool that appears to exist. He urges the utilization by student counselors of interest tests like the Strong; thus, discussing a student's general vocational interests provides a good opportunity for bringing up the possibility of a religious vocation, he notes.

Murray's report is reviewed here primarily because it deals with comparisons made between seminarians and comparable non-seminarians, and because it is another good example of the kind of comparison studies which have been done up to now using such groups. Thus, heretofore the published studies which compared seminarians and non-seminarians did so on the basis of personality traits or interests, whereas this study compares some of their attitudes about the priest and his work. This makes the results of the present study only indirectly related to those of Murray, especially in view of the fact that his lay group consisted of college students as opposed to high school students. Also, the present study used only minor seminarians, whereas Murray used minor and major seminarians as well as priests.

CHAPTER III

CONSTRUCTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

Making up the questions posed a difficult and serious problem—difficult because so little has been done along these lines, and serious because the value of this entire study hinges on the quality and pertinence of the questionnaire.

The problem as seen during construction of the questionnaire was to build a set of items which could be answered in about forty minutes so that the students could complete it during a class or study period. This time had to allow for having the students provide information about themselves as well as answering the questions about the priesthood.

Considerable thought was given to the problem of obtaining a maximum of information about the opinions of the subjects in the time available to question them. In selecting areas of content which held promise of being meaningful and pertinent to the broad and specific purposes of this thesis, considerable time was spent getting familiar with the literature reviewed in chapter two, and with research work and materials available from the Religion and Mental Health Project at Loyola University. In order to solve the opposite problem of limiting the content areas of inquiry in the questionnaire to manageable proportions, on the other hand, it was finally decided that a relatively small number of basic questions would be asked with many sub-items which could be answered differentially by each subject, thereby tapping his opinions or

attitudes about certain general topics and going into some detail about each. This idea originated from an examination of the many ranking type of questions used by the reviewed studies.

The ranking approach had certain kinds of drawbacks that made it undesirable, however, mainly because an opinion obtained about each specific item of the general question was entirely relative to the opinions held about all of the other items. This feature of the ranking approach was considered especially undesirable when one wanted to investigate group differences with respect to the individual items in a general question. For example, group A might see an occupation as less similar to the priesthood than does group B, but both groups A and B might see this occupation as having the same degree of similarity relative to that of several other occupations; the opposite could also occur, whereby both groups might see an occupation as having the same degree of similarity to the priesthood, but rank it differently with respect to its similarity relative to that of several other occupations. Moreover one can compare opinions with the ranking approach only by giving two subject groups the same identical question in toto; leaving out or changing one or two items to be ranked could affect the pattern of group differences on all the items in a ranking question, and would make certain inter-group comparisons impossible. For example, if group A ranked four occupations for their similarity to the priesthood, and group B did the same for these four plus two more occupations, there would be no way to assess differences in the rankings of groups A and B for the four occupations they both ranked in common. (Similarity probably could be assessed by doing a rank correlation of the ranks of the mean rank scores for the four occupations.)

Considerations like the foregoing led to a search for a method of questioning subjects which would eliminate many of the above shortcomings but retain an important value of the ranking approach, namely, that it enables the experimenter to obtain information regarding subjects' opinions about a large number of specific items in a short period of time. In searching for and proposing a solution to this problem, it became desirable to propose some secondary hypotheses to the main one being explored in this thesis. However, before proceeding to the discussion of these matters, a consideration of the primary hypotheses appears in order.

The Main Hypotheses of this Study

The emphasis in this study is the demonstration of purported differences between the groups studied in their opinions or attitudes about the priesthood. Hence the main hypothesis being investigated is: that seminarian and non-seminarian Catholic boys at the secondary school level have differences of opinion about the priesthood, priestly work and priestly behavior which can be assessed through the questionnaire method.

This is being investigated for two age levels of students, ninth and twelfth graders, hence secondary comparisons have been made to investigate age differences within and between the seminary and non-seminary groups. And one might say a secondary hypothesis that there will be age differences within and between the groups could also be proposed. So all in all there can be six subsidiary hypotheses identified simply on the basis that there were four subject-groups studied involving six inter-group comparisons on each part of the questionnaire.

There can also be an elaboration into subsidiary hypotheses based on the different content areas investigated by the different parts of the questionnaire. Thus, taking this to the most specific level, all of the hypotheses in the above paragraph can be applied to each item and meaningful grouping of items on the questionnaire. This will not be done explicitly, however, because of the large number of individual items involved and because many items were inserted without the express purpose of finding inter-group differences.

Thus while the focus of the discussion of results will be on examining the data for inter-group differences of opinion, questionnaire items also were chosen with the idea of finding similarities that exist as well; it was thought that this would be a more balanced, thorough and meaningful approach than simply including items which the experimenter had a hunch might show inter-group differences. The necessarily exploratory nature of this study would also appear to warrant this approach to item construction.

Basic Format of the Questions

In searching for a way to use the format of ranking questions without the drawbacks involved in the ranking approach itself, the experimenter hit upon the idea of having the subjects independently rate instead of rank each item of the question. This rating approach enabled the setting up of a general question posed to the subject about his opinions, then asking the subject to rate his opinion about specific items or areas of content as this general question was applied to them. In other words, the subject would be given a general set and framework of response, then asked to indicate his opinion about a number of content areas or items using the approach and structure provided. The use of the same set and framework of response by all subjects provides a solid basis for

comparing the responses of different subjects (and groups thereof) through the use of statistical techniques. As will be seen, this also involved a borrowing from the scaling approach to item construction (see Carrett, 1947, pp. 164-176). Before attempting to discuss further the merits seen in this method of item construction, it appears best to present questions one and two in order to provide a concrete focus for this discussion.

Question One

This question is given on the following page. The rationale for its use can be discussed from three viewpoints, namely, the basis for the content area explored, the basis for the rating categories used, and the reasons for using both the rating and ranking approaches.

With respect to content, the role of the priest was one area studied to quite an extent in the literature reviewed by chapter two. The question itself is modeled after that used by the four Belgian nuns (Anonymous, 1957, question one) and the Loyola study (Herr, to be published). This approach was finally used in preference to those used by Babin (1953, question one) and Schuyler (1960, p. 175). Babin's approach was not considered so readily applicable to United States subjects, primarily because the categories for different types of priests would have to be revised considerably before it would be very meaningful. Also, it seemed to be less effective than the other approach in taking into account the multiple roles played by most priests. Schuyler's question was in many ways considered more meaningful and pertinent than the approach used, on the other hand, especially as an attempt to assess opinions about the roles of the priest. After some consideration, however, it was decided not to use Schuyler's approach because it was considered very likely that the religious

QUESTION ONE

For each of the following occupations or jobs, indicate your opinion of how similar it is to the work of the priest. Cross out the letter of the category below which is closest to your opinion.

X

Y

Z

Great Similarity

Some Similarity

Little or no Similarity

(e.g. ~~X~~ Y Z The Priesthood)

- a. X Y Z Architect_____
- b. X Y Z Business man_____
- c. X Y Z Counselor_____
- d. X Y Z Doctor_____
- e. X Y Z Engineer_____
- f. X Y Z Foreman_____
- g. X Y Z Judge_____
- h. X Y Z Lawyer_____
- i. X Y Z Manager_____
- j. X Y Z Professor_____
- k. X Y Z Scientist_____
- l. X Y Z Salesman_____
- m. X Y Z Soldier_____
- n. X Y Z Teacher_____

Now rank the jobs above according to the degree of their similarity to the work of the priest. Write in the rank for each job in the space following it above. Thus, write the number "1" after the job you think is most like the priest's work; write "2" after the job which comes next, and so on, until you have written "14" after the job which you think is least like the work of the priest.

instruction given to the students in school might play the dominant role in determining their answers. Thus seminary students especially could be expected to know from their training that the roles of mediator and liturgical leader are seen as most important in the eyes of the Church. Finally, the approach used by the four Belgian nuns and the Loyola study appeared to have possible significance in relation to the findings obtained by Lhota (1948) with respect to the measured interest patterns of major seminarians and what occupational groups had similar interest patterns.

Three rating categories were used for question one because it was considered equivalent to a uni-directional rating scale, namely, one which goes in a positive direction only.

It was thought that the rating approach to this type of question would provide more and better information than the ranking approach would, and that the best way of demonstrating this would be to use both approaches for the same question and then compare the findings obtained from each approach. Since the purpose for using each method was to determine differences which might occur simply on the basis of the methods as such, the probability of contamination occurring between the rating and ranking methods was not seen as a handicap; rather, any contamination would probably tend to reduce the differences between the results obtained from the two methods, if anything. Thus, if a subject tends to revise his ratings so that they are logically compatible with his rankings, or if he approaches his rankings so that they are consistent with his ratings (i.e. all occupations rated "X" are ranked highest, and all occupations rated "Y" are ranked higher than those rated "Z"), so much the better for demonstrating any differences in findings which might occur simply on the basis of

using the two different methods.

Question Two

This question was based almost entirely on a ranking question used in the Belgian study (Anonymous, 1957, question five) and repeated in the Loyola study, with some changes and additions made to suit it for use with United States subjects. It is given on the following page. As on question one, both the rating and ranking approaches were used, and for the same reasons. Four rating categories were used because there was some question about the scaling of desirability being capable of extension in both a positive and negative direction thereby necessitating five rating categories; however, only positive qualities were listed, hence three categories would seem to be sufficient, yet it was decided to extend it to four categories to make sure that the subjects had a wide enough freedom of choice. If it turned out that three were sufficient, categories could always be combined for statistical purposes, and the number reduced to three in any future work done.

Some Secondary Hypotheses

For questions one and two, two secondary hypotheses should be stated explicitly in relation to the use of both the rating and ranking approaches. The first of these hypotheses is simply that the ranking and rating approaches will provide different patterns of subject-group differences with respect to the various items in each question. The second is that the rating approach will provide more complete, more usable and more meaningful information about the opinions of the subject-groups than will the ranking approach, and without the two approaches differing greatly in their assessment of each subject-group's consensus about the relative rank of each item in the questions. That is, the

Below is a list of qualities or virtues. Indicate how desirable you think it would be for a priest to have each quality named. Cross out the letter of the category below which is closest to your opinion.

- | | A | B | C | D | |
|----|----------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Very Desirable | Desirable | Slightly Desirable | Not Necessarily Desirable | |
| a. | A | B | C | D | Ability to give up comfort_____ |
| b. | A | B | C | D | Cheerfulness_____ |
| c. | A | B | C | D | Courage_____ |
| d. | A | B | C | D | Hope in God_____ |
| e. | A | B | C | D | Humility_____ |
| f. | A | B | C | D | Intelligence_____ |
| g. | A | B | C | D | Patience with others_____ |
| h. | A | B | C | D | Perseverance_____ |
| i. | A | B | C | D | Persuasiveness_____ |
| j. | A | B | C | D | Politeness_____ |
| k. | A | B | C | D | Respect for People_____ |
| l. | A | B | C | D | Sense of Humor_____ |
| m. | A | B | C | D | Sincerity_____ |
| n. | A | B | C | D | Tolerance_____ |
| o. | A | B | C | D | Understanding_____ |
| p. | A | B | C | D | Will power_____ |
| q. | A | B | C | D | Zeal_____ |

Now rank these qualities in the order of their desirability. For each quality above, write its rank in the space following it. Thus, write the number "1" after the quality which you think is most desirable for a priest to have; write "2" after the quality which comes next; and so on, until you have written "17" after the quality above which is the least desirable of these named for a priest to have.

rating approach will enable an experimenter to get nearly equivalent group rankings of all the qualities (in question two) to those which would be obtained through the use of the ranking method; and beyond this the rating approach will provide better information than the ranking approach.

Question Three

This question, given on the following page, was developed from ideas gained in interviewing lay people concerning their ideas about the priesthood. Many of these lay persons showed concern about the propriety of certain kinds of behavior on the part of the priest, particularly when it might be held up for criticism by their non-Catholic friends. In preparing the present questionnaire, it was thought this would present an area of inquiry which would be valuable to tap in terms of what lay persons consider proper and improper behavior by the priest, and that it very possibly might reveal differences between seminarians and non-seminarians in matters which are not very directly influenced by their differences in academic and other training in school.

Five rating categories were used since among the activities there were some considered proper and some which appeared susceptible of being considered improper by the subjects.

Question Four

This question grew largely out of the concern that the Loyola Religion and Mental Health project showed over the attitudes of priests toward psychiatry and mental health, and over how well priests know and utilize sound counseling techniques as judged by the modern mental health disciplines. In attempting to assess this the project workers focused most of their work on the priests and seminarians (or future priests) themselves, and on their training curriculum in

QUESTION THREE

Indicate your opinion of how proper it is for a priest to engage in each of the following activities. Cross out the letter of the category below which is closest to your opinion.

A

B

C

D

E

Very Proper

Proper

Sometimes Proper

Seldom Proper

Never Proper

- a. A B C D E Administer the sacraments.
- b. A B C D E Bet money at a race track.
- c. A B C D E Drink beer or liquor in public.
- d. A B C D E Golf in public.
- e. A B C D E Help husbands and wives solve marital problems.
- f. A B C D E Lead a fund raising drive for charity.
- g. A B C D E Play cards for money.
- h. A B C D E Participate in group dancing.
- i. A B C D E Say mass.
- j. A B C D E Smoke in public.
- k. A B C D E Swim at a public beach.
- l. A B C D E Teach in school.
- m. A B C D E Try to help solve quarrels between children and parents.
- n. A B C D E Wear non-clerical clothes in public.
- o. A B C D E Work to promote the campaign of a political candidate.

the seminaries—this, of course, being the primary purpose of the project as conceived by the National Institute of Mental Health. Question four, which is given on the next page, represents an attempt to get some information about how understanding the priest is seen to be when he is functioning in his well-known role of counselor to parishioners. Five rating categories were used on the assumption that both positive and negative opinions could be expressed on this matter.

Question Five

This question also grew largely out of the above factors. It was thought desirable to see if the subjects in any way tended to differentiate the work of the priest as counselor from the work of other mental health professions in terms of the type of problems for which people might seek help. The entire question as presented to the subjects is given on page 83. The subjects were given three categories or types of counselor to check: psychologist, priest and psychiatrist. These are discrete categories and do not represent any kind of rating gradation as was the case on all the other questions.

Question Six

This question grew out of the work done in reviewing the interviews of priests and seminarians by other members of the Loyola Religion and Mental Health project. In many of these interviews emotional reactions were expressed toward the various roles priests perform and how they are expected to handle them. The thought struck this writer that emotional satisfactions as well as spiritual rewards are important to the priest in enabling him to perform his functions well. Also, that such emotional factors could be important in determining whether an individual has a vocation to the priesthood (or at least to a

QUESTION FOUR

Below is a list of problems which a lay Catholic might have. Indicate how well you would expect the average priest to understand each problem by crossing out the letter of the category below which is closest to your opinion.

The average priest would understand this problem:

- | | A | B | C | D | E | |
|----|-----------|------|-------------|--------|-------------|--|
| | Very Well | Well | Fairly Well | Poorly | Very Poorly | |
| a. | A | B | C | D | E | Trouble accepting some teaching of the Church. |
| b. | A | B | C | D | E | Difficulty doing well in school or academic work. |
| c. | A | B | C | D | E | Disagreement or conflict with one's parents. |
| d. | A | B | C | D | E | Habit of losing one's temper and doing wrong things out of anger |
| e. | A | B | C | D | E | Difficulty with money—financial problems. |
| f. | A | B | C | D | E | Trouble getting to Mass on Sundays. |
| g. | A | B | C | D | E | Improper sex desires. |
| h. | A | B | C | D | E | Trouble living up to the fasting regulations of the Church. |
| i. | A | B | C | D | E | Constantly using vulgar or indecent language. |
| j. | A | B | C | D | E | Anger toward a priest for something he said or did. |
| k. | A | B | C | D | E | Hardships parents have in raising their children. |
| l. | A | B | C | D | E | Habit of coming late to Sunday Mass. |
| m. | A | B | C | D | E | Failure to give enough money to the Church. |
| n. | A | B | C | D | E | Inability to get along with one's spouse (husband and wife). |
| o. | A | B | C | D | E | Being afraid about going to confession. |

QUESTION FIVE

Below is a list of problems for which a person might seek outside help. For each problem, indicate which type of outside person below would in your opinion be best able to provide help by crossing out the appropriate letter.

X

Y

Z

Counseling Psychologist

Priest or Minister

Psychiatrist

- a. X Y Z A young person wants to decide what occupation to choose.
- b. X Y Z A person has financial or money problems.
- c. X Y Z A husband and wife constantly disagree, argue and fight with each other.
- d. X Y Z A person constantly sees or hears things that don't really exist.
- e. X Y Z A student is having trouble getting his schoolwork well enough.
- f. X Y Z A person wants to talk something over in private without having to worry that it will become known by outsiders.
- g. X Y Z A parent wants to get his child over a great fear of going to school.
- h. X Y Z A husband and wife cannot get along sexually with each other.
- i. X Y Z A person believes he is God or the Messiah.
- j. X Y Z A person has great difficulty controlling his temper.
- k. X Y Z A person has sexual wants which he does not want or cannot control.
- l. X Y Z A person wants to get over an abnormal fear of certain things.
- m. X Y Z Parents are having trouble getting their children to obey them properly.
- n. X Y Z A person is afraid to go to confession.
- o. X Y Z A person wants help for something and doesn't know who else to see.
- p. X Y Z A person feels like everything he does is a sin.

certain kind of priestly life). Such factors do seem to provide worthwhile indication of the existence of a vocation to the priesthood according to the work of Iyota (1948) and Murray (1957) reviewed in the previous chapter. Hence it was decided worthwhile to see if seminarians and non-seminarians would differ with respect to how much satisfaction they thought the average priest would get out of various functions he performs. This was done in question six, given on the next page, in which the subjects were asked to rate how much satisfaction they thought the average priest gets out of the various activities listed. Five rating categories were provided in order to "stretch out" or reveal any possible shades of difference as much as possible.

Introductory Statement to the Questionnaire

Virtually the same statement was used for all the groups except that one extra phrase was included for the seminarians. The entire introduction is given on page 86 with the phrase used only for the seminarians put in parentheses.

Information Obtained from the Subjects About Themselves

All the subjects were asked to give the following information about themselves: Their birthdate, place of birth, and where they lived most of their life; each parent's occupation, place of birth, religion, and place where they have lived most of their life; the name of the subject's parish and its location; whether the subject is a lifelong Catholic, convert, or has some other status in this regard; the number of near relatives (brothers or sisters, uncles or aunts, first cousins) who became or were then in training to become priests or nuns; the number of near relatives who began study for these vocations but stopped for some reason; the names of the schools attended by the subject with the

QUESTION SIX

Below is a list of activities common to priests. For each one, give your opinion or estimate of how much satisfaction or enjoyment the average priest is likely to get from it. Cross out the letter of the category below which best describes your opinion or estimate.

The Average Priest:

A	B	C	D	E		
Gets Very Much Satisfaction	Gets Much Satisfaction	Gets Some Satisfaction	Gets a Little Satisfaction	Gets Very Little Satisfaction		
a.	A	B	C	D	E	Giving sermons.
b.	A	B	C	D	E	Baptizing children.
c.	A	B	C	D	E	Teaching school.
d.	A	B	C	D	E	Visiting the sick.
e.	A	B	C	D	E	Giving instructions to convert and inquiry classes.
f.	A	B	C	D	E	Raising money for the Church.
g.	A	B	C	D	E	Visiting the dying.
h.	A	B	C	D	E	Saying Mass.
i.	A	B	C	D	E	Presiding at weddings.
j.	A	B	C	D	E	Running the Parish business affairs.
k.	A	B	C	D	E	Hearing confessions.
l.	A	B	C	D	E	Saying his office or breviary prayers.
m.	A	B	C	D	E	Handling Parish social events.
n.	A	B	C	D	E	Presiding at funerals.
o.	A	B	C	D	E	Giving Communion.
p.	A	B	C	D	E	Counseling parishioners.

Introduction

This questionnaire is part of a study of the priesthood being conducted at Loyola University with the cooperation and approval of school authorities. Please fill out your answers to all the questions, keeping in mind the following rules:

- a. Remember that the questions are seeking your personal opinions about the matters covered, and nothing more; do not worry about the rightness or wrongness of your opinions.
- b. Do not spend a great deal of time thinking over your answer to any item; merely give your opinion of the moment and let it go at that.
- c. Do not consult with anyone else about your answers; this would destroy the purpose of the questionnaire, namely, to get your own personal opinions.

After you have answered the questions, please fill in the information sheets as accurately and fully as you can. In doing so, remember that all your answers and information will be held in strict confidence (and that they will not in any way be shown to seminary authorities). Results will be considered apart from any reference to who you are. For this reason feel free to omit your name from the information sheet if you wish.

THANK YOU for your cooperation.

length of time attended and an indication of whether each school was Catholic, public or of some other type; and whether or not the subject has ever had a serious disagreement with a priest or other religious. In addition the high school subjects were asked if they had ever been in a seminary for the purpose of becoming a priest, and how often on the average a priest visits in their home.

The introduction was the cover page of the questionnaire, followed by six pages with the six questions in the order they are numbered, and the information sheets were the two back pages. The exact procedures used in administering the questionnaire will be described in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

PROCEDURE OF DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Administration of the Questionnaire

The subjects from each of the four groups were administered the questionnaire by the writer during a regular class period of the spring semester of school. For three of the groups this was done during a study hall period, and for the fourth year seminarian group during a religion class period. In every instance a faculty member of the school gave the students an introduction to the experimenter and urged them to cooperate to the best of their ability with the questionnaire to be presented. The class was then turned over to the experimenter who monitored the administration of the questionnaire and answered any questions that came up. The introduction was read aloud by the experimenter at the start and the students were reminded of the information sheets at the back. When a student was finished he was told he could turn in his questionnaire and then study or read until the period was over. All the groups had at least forty minutes to work on the questionnaire, and in no group did any students appear to have difficulty finishing in the time available.

Analysis of Data for Group Differences

The raw score frequencies made by all the members of each subject group were tabulated for each item. In the case of questions one and two, two such raw score tabulations were made for each item, one for the rating scores (questions one and two) and one for the ranking scores (questions 1R and 2R).

For each item, six inter-group comparisons were made contrasting the raw score frequencies of each subject group with those of every other subject group. Initially each such comparison was made on the basis of a χ^2 test to determine whether a statistically significant difference existed between the two subject groups on the item. Where necessary to keep all expected frequencies (Fe 's) above five in the χ^2 computations, and/or where it was advantageous for obtaining a significant χ^2 score, adjacent rating or ranking categories were combined. And wherever different combinations were possible, all that offered any possibility of resulting in a statistically significant χ^2 were tried, whether such combinations were at the same or at different degrees of freedom. The usual procedure was to start by using combinations possible at the highest degrees of freedom; and if those did not result in statistically significant χ^2 's but were close to significance, then combinations involving lower degrees of freedom were tried until a significant χ^2 was obtained or until all possibilities were exhausted without a significant χ^2 being obtained.

The formula used for making the χ^2 computations is as follows:

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(Fo - Fe)^2}{Fe}$$

This formula was obtained from Guilford (1950, page 276). In it Fo stands for the observed frequency and Fe the expected frequency of each cell in the χ^2 table. The expected frequency was computed for each cell by multiplying the summation of the row times the summation of the column in which the cell occurred, then dividing this product by the total N of the two subject groups being compared on the item. The expected frequency was always computed to the

nearest tenth (first decimal point) for each cell, as was the difference between the observed and expected frequencies ($F_o - F_e$) for each cell. The square of this difference, or $(F_o - F_e)^2$, was computed to the nearest hundredth (second decimal point), as was the Chi^2 for each cell.

Whenever the Chi^2 table was 2×2 so that there was one degree of freedom, the Yates correction for continuity was used (Guilford, 1950, p. 278). This involved reducing the difference between each cell's F_o and F_e by .5 before squaring the difference and dividing it by F_e to obtain the Chi^2 . The Yates correction was not used whenever there was more than one degree of freedom (see Guilford, 1950, p. 279).

In computing the various Chi^2 possibilities for each inter-group comparison on each item, attention was given to detecting the existence of what are called directional differences between the groups. Basically the Chi^2 test shows whether or not there is a statistically significant difference in the distributions of scores (ratings or rankings) made on an item by two groups of subjects. However, the present study is interested in more than simply this, namely, in an indication of whether one subject group rated or ranked the item higher than the other subject group. The latter can be said to be demonstrated when the distributional difference involves one group having higher F_o 's than F_e 's on all the Chi^2 cells at one end of the table, and vice versa for all the remaining Chi^2 cells at the opposite end of the table. For example, on question one there were three rating categories: "X", "Y" and "Z" in that order. If the first group's F_o is higher than its F_e for frequency of "X" ratings, and vice versa for "Y" and "Z" ratings (so that just the opposite would be true for the second group), then—assuming "X", "Y" and "Z" form at least an ordinal scale—

a directional distributional difference could be assumed indicating that the first group saw the item as having greater similarity than did the second group. On the other hand, if the first group had a higher F_o than F_e for frequency of both "X" and "Z" ratings, and vice versa for "Y" ratings, a distributional difference might exist which could result in a statistically significant χ^2 score; but this would not be directional and one could not say either group saw the item as more similar than did the other group.

This notion of the directional as distinguished from the non-directional distributional difference was always considered in trying combinations of adjacent categories for the purpose of computing χ^2 's at different degrees of freedom (and using different combinations at the same degrees of freedom). The rule followed was this: if adjacent categories could be combined so that a significant χ^2 was obtained indicating a directional inter-group difference, then the existence of combinations which resulted in differences not clearly directional in nature were ignored as far as reporting was concerned—even when the non-directional difference might be much more significant than the directional difference. Only if no combination of adjacent categories resulted in a significant or near significant directional difference was any significant or near significant non-directional difference reported.

For the purposes of this study, a statistically significant difference was assumed when the χ^2 had a probability of .05 or less, and a near significant difference when the χ^2 had a probability greater than .05 but .10 or less.

There were a few instances in which the possibility of a statistically significant difference existed between two groups on an item, but the χ^2 test

couldn't be used because it was not possible to get four cells in a 2x2 table all having an F_0 of at least five. When this occurred, Fisher's exact test of probability was used to determine whether the difference was statistically significant (see Siegal, 1956, pp. 94-104).

The Use of Representative Scores

It was considered very desirable to give the readers of this paper some indication of the categories in which each group's ratings or rankings occurred. The use of raw score frequency distributions for this purpose was considered very clumsy and inadequate, however. Accordingly, it was decided to compute a proportion score for each group's rating of each item on every question. This was done by assuming that the highest rating had a value of +1.00, the lowest rating a value of zero or—in the case of the questions having five rating categories—a value of -1.00, and the intermediate ratings a proportionate value in between the two extremes. In the case of question five, a value of +1.00 was assigned for every subject who checked "Priest or Minister" on the item, and a value of zero assigned if one of the other two categories (psychologist or psychiatrist) was checked.

In computing these rough representative indexes or proportion scores, the sum of each group's rating values was obtained and divided by the number of subjects answering that item intelligibly. Hence the representative index is basically a mean score of the group's ratings of the item.

For the two ranking questions (1R and 2R) mean rank scores were computed for each item to serve as the representative indexes.

These mean proportion and rank scores were not used in any way as a basis for determining inter-group differences on the items, it should be emphasized.

They merely serve to give a single index of the opinion of the group as a whole about the item. They thus provide helpful information concerning the opinions or attitudes of each group about each item apart from the issue of whether inter-group differences exist or not.

Invalid Answers

Whenever a subject failed to answer an item or question, or whenever the intent of an answer could not be clearly ascertained by the experimenter, that particular item or question was ruled as unanswered and not considered in the tabulations of the scores given by the group to which that subject belonged. On all the rating questions, this could be done on the basis of individual items. Thus, if a subject did not answer two items in the rating part of question two, his answers to the other items could still be used. On the ranking questions, however, this had to be done on the basis of the question as a whole. Thus, if two items on the ranking part of question two were left unanswered, the question as a whole had to be considered unanswered and that subject's rankings were not counted for any of the items. No subject's answers were discarded for failure to fill in the answers requested on the information sheets attached at the back of the questionnaire.

Group Differences for Items Combined

On all the rating questions it can be seen that the ratings by each subject group of all the items of a question can be combined for the purpose of doing a Chi^2 test to determine if inter-group differences exist for the question as a whole. This can be done because the subjects' ratings made for each item can be considered independent of their ratings made for every other item. Such comparisons between the subject groups for the entire questions were made

using the Chi^2 test and following the rules already discussed earlier in this chapter.

Further clarification of the procedures used in analyzing the data collected in this study will be made when the results themselves are discussed in chapter six.

CHAPTER V

DESCRIPTION OF THE GROUPS STUDIED

The subjects were selected from two schools located in the vicinity of a large midwestern United States metropolitan area. More specific information about the locations of the schools will not be provided since the authorities of both schools were assured of as much anonymity as possible. The seminarian groups both came from the same minor seminary, which is run by the local diocese for the training of diocesan priests. The non-seminarian groups were both taken from a Catholic high school for boys, which is run by a teaching religious order and is oriented primarily to a college preparatory course of studies. In the case of both first year groups, the classes selected represented the brighter or "faster" groups in their school; whereas both senior groups were considered average in their academic status at each school.

All the groups were administered the questionnaire within a week's time. The greatest span was between the two first year groups; the high school freshmen (I₁ Group) were given the questionnaire exactly one week after the first year seminarians (S₁ Group). The high school seniors (I₄ Group) were given the questionnaire two days after the first year seminarians and three days before the fourth year seminarians (S₄ Group).

Ages of Subjects

Table 21 gives information about the ages of the subjects in each group at the time they took the questionnaire. This shows that the two first and two

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AGES OF THE SUBJECTS AT THE
TIME OF TAKING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Category	Group			
	<u>L 1</u>	<u>S 1</u>	<u>L 4</u>	<u>S 4</u>
Total number of subjects in the group	43	36	34	31
Number who (clearly) reported birthdate	42	36	33	29
	Age in Years-Months to Nearest Whole Month:			
Oldest subject	15- 6	20- 0	19- 0	18- 4
Third Quartile (Q 3)	15- 1	15- 1	18- 2	18- 2
Median (Q 2)	14-10	14- 9	17-11	17-11
First Quartile (Q 1)	14- 6	14- 6	17- 8	17- 8
Youngest subject	13- 9	14- 1	16-11	17- 4
Mean Age of Group	14-10	14-11	17-10	17-11

fourth year groups are very similar with respect to the ages of group members, and that apart from a few extreme scores there was not much skewness in the distribution of age levels within the groups (see Guilford, 1950, p. 76 and 91-92).

Subjects' Place of Birth and Where They Lived Most of Their Lives

Table 22 gives a summary of the information which the subjects gave in response to questions asking their place of birth and "Where have you lived most of your life?" This shows that the groups were predominantly from the

WHERE SUBJECTS WERE BORN AND REPORTED HAVING LIVED MOST OF THEIR LIVES

Place	Percentages of Subjects in Each Group Reporting Where:							
	Born:				Lived Most of Lives:			
	L 1 (N=43)	S 1 (N=36)	L 4 (N=34)	S 4 (N=31)	L 1 (N=43)	S 1 (N=36)	L 4 (N=34)	S 4 (N=31)
Metro. Area of schools	72	78	79	81	86	86	88	97
Elsewhere midwest U.S.	7	11	12	16	2	11	3	-
Eastern U.S.	14	3	3	-	7	3	-	-
Western U.S.	-	3	3	3	-	-	-	3
Varied places in U.S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
Outside U.S.	5	6	3	-	2	-	6	-
Not indicated	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-

metropolitan area where the schools are located, and that they are primarily a midwestern United States sample.

Occupations of the Subjects' Parents

Table 23 is an attempt to give a categorized breakdown of parental occupations; it is based on the writer's classification of the responses given by the subjects when they were asked the occupation of each of their parents. A wide variety of descriptive phrases were used by the subjects in each group, often making the writer's classifications somewhat arbitrary. The occupational categories used are based on reports by the United States Census Bureau.

EXPERIMENTER'S CLASSIFICATION OF REPORTED OCCUPATIONS OF SUBJECTS' PARENTS

Occupational Category	Percentages of:							
	Fathers of Group:				Mothers of Group:			
	L 1 (N=43)	S 1 (N=36)	L 4 (N=34)	S 4 (N=31)	L 1 (N=43)	S 1 (N=36)	L 4 (N=34)	S 4 (N=31)
Professional, technical, kindred workers	44	28	44	29	9	6	6	16
Managers, proprietors, except farm	19	17	24	26	-	-	-	3
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	23	22	9	6	2	11	12	3
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	5	25	6	16	-	-	-	3
Operatives and kindred workers	2	6	3	-	-	8	-	-
Service workers, except household	2	-	-	10	-	-	-	-
Laborers, except farm	-	-	6	3	-	-	-	3
Keeping house	-	-	-	-	77	72	74	68
Deceased	2	3	6	10	5	3	3	3
Not (clearly) indicated	2	-	3	-	7	-	6	-

Parents' Place of Birth and Where They Lived Most of Their Lives

Table 24 gives a summary of the information about where the subjects' fathers were born and lived most of their lives; and table 25 gives the same information about the subjects' mothers. These tables show that most of the

Table 24

WHERE SUBJECTS' FATHERS WERE REPORTED BORN AND HAVING LIVED MOST OF LIVES

Place	Percentages of Fathers of Each Group:							
	Reported Birthplaces:				Reported Places Where Lived Most of Lives:			
	L 1 (N=43)	S 1 (N=36)	L 4 (N=34)	S 4 (N=31)	L 1 (N=43)	S 1 (N=36)	L 4 (N=34)	S 4 (N=31)
Metro. area of schools	42	64	59	68	67	75	79	87
Elsewhere midwest U.S.	14	19	24	23	7	14	12	6
Eastern U.S.	21	6	3	-	16	3	-	-
Southern U.S.	5	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
Varied or unspecified places in U.S.	-	3	-	-	-	-	6	-
Outside U.S.	14	8	12	3	5	3	3	-
Not (clearly) indicated	5	-	-	6	5	6	-	6

subjects' parents came from the metropolitan area where the schools are located, and that the subjects come primarily from families in which the parents have lived most of their lives in the midwestern United States.

Religion of the Subjects and Their Parents

All of the subjects had at least one parent who was Catholic, and in most instances both parents were reported as being Catholics. Thus from the L1 group, 36 (84%) reported both parents as Catholic (one said his father is a convert); three (7%) said only their father is Catholic while each of their

Table 25

WHERE SUBJECTS' MOTHERS WERE REPORTED BORN AND HAVING LIVED MOST OF LIVES

Place	Percentages of Mothers of Each Group:							
	Reported Birthplaces:				Reported Places Where Lived Most of Lives:			
	L 1 (N=43)	S 1 (N=36)	L 4 (N=34)	S 4 (N=31)	L 1 (N=43)	S 1 (N=36)	L 4 (N=34)	S 4 (N=31)
Metro. area of schools	35	56	68	68	58	64	82	97
Elsewhere midwest U.S.	16	17	21	26	12	8	6	3
Eastern U.S.	12	8	3	-	12	6	3	-
Southern U.S.	9	3	-	-	5	-	-	-
Varied or unspecified places in U.S.	-	3	-	-	-	6	6	-
Outside U.S.	16	11	9	3	7	11	3	-
Not (clearly) indicated	12	3	-	3	7	6	-	-

respective mothers is Protestant, deceased and professing no religion ("none"); three said only their mother is Catholic while each of their respective fathers is Protestant, "non-Catholic" and professing no religion; one subject (2%) did not answer. In the S1 group, 34 (94%) reported both parents as Catholics (in one instance the mother was converted two years before), one (3%) reported his father to be Catholic and his mother deceased, and one reported his mother to be Catholic and his father Protestant. Thirty (88%) of the L4 group reported that both parents are Catholic; two (6%) reported Catholic mothers with the

respective fathers a Christian Scientist and a non-believer ("none"); one (3%) reported a Catholic father and Lutheran mother; and one subject did not answer this question. Finally, 26 in the S₁ group (84%) reported that both parents are Catholic (in one instance one parent was converted from Christian Science two years before); one (3%) reported a Catholic father and "Christian" mother; and four (13%) reported Catholic mothers while each of the fathers was reported as a Lutheran, a deceased Protestant, deceased, and a non-believer.

All of the subjects who answered the question about their own religion said they were lifelong Catholics. Two in the S₁ group did not answer this question, but one of these reported both parents as Catholics; the other did not indicate the religion of his parents.

Near Relatives Known to Have Pursued a Priestly or Religious Vocation

The subjects were asked four different questions in this area: one asking the number of near relatives "who became or are now in training to become priests", one asking the same regarding nuns, one asking how many near relatives "began study and preparation for the priesthood and stopped for some reason", and one asking the same concerning relatives having studied to be nuns.

Table 26 summarizes the responses given to these questions, which were answered by all the subjects except one member of the I₁ group. Of note here is the large number of subjects in the I₁ group having relatives who are nuns or studying for this vocation; also, that the S₁ group has a relatively large number of relatives who dropped out of training for the priesthood.

Type of Schools Attended by Subjects

Most of the subjects went exclusively to Catholic schools (excluding kindergarten from consideration). Thus, 31 members of the I₁ group (72%) went

Table 26

**NEAR RELATIVES OF SUBJECTS KNOWN TO HAVE BECOME, OR
STUDIED FOR BECOMING, PRIESTS OR NUNS**

Subjects' Near Relatives Who Fell into Category of Having:	Number in Each Category	Percentages of Subjects From Group:			
		L 1 (N=42)	S 1 (N=36)	L 4 (N=34)	S 4 (N=31)
Become priests or were in training for this:	None	69	67	71	61
	One	21	28	24	19
	Two or more	10	6	6	19
Become nuns or were in training for this:	None	57	78	79	77
	One	36	14	9	10
	Two or more	7	8	12	13
Failed to complete training for the priesthood:	None	81	69	88	55
	One	17	19	12	39
	Two or more	2	11	-	6
Failed to complete training to become nuns:	None	98	92	91	94
	One	2	8	9	6
	Two or more	-	-	-	-
Subjects who had no known relatives in any of the above four categories		48	44	53	29
Subjects who knew of relatives that became priests or nuns (or were in training to) <u>and</u> others that failed to complete training		21	25	15	32
Subjects who knew only of relatives that became priests or nuns (or were in training)		31	22	26	19
Subjects who knew only of relatives that failed to complete training		-	8	6	19

entirely to Catholic schools, and eight (19%) had most of their schooling in Catholic schools; two (5%) received less than half their schooling in Catholic schools, and two did not give information about this. Of the S1 group, 31 (86%) went entirely to Catholic schools, three (8%) got most of their schooling in Catholic schools, and two (6%) didn't indicate this information. From the L4 group, 29 (85%) received all of their education in Catholic schools, three (9%) mostly in Catholic schools, one (3%) in mostly non-Catholic schools, and one didn't answer. From the S4 group, 27 (87%) received all of their education in Catholic schools and two (6%) mostly in Catholic schools; the other two did not answer.

Other Information About the Subjects

Four members of the L1 group (9%) said they had at least one serious disagreement with a priest or nun, and one other said no but that he has been "mad at them". Only one member of the S1 group (3%) reported ever having a serious disagreement with a priest. Three members of the S4 group (10%) and 13 from the L4 group (38%) reported they had at least one serious disagreement with a priest.

None of the L1 group but two of the L4 group reported that they had once been in seminary training. Two members of the S1 group reported that they planned to leave the seminary at the end of the school year, and one member of the L1 group reported that he planned to enter the seminary, even though there was no formal place to indicate these things on the information sheet.

In the L1 group, 24 members (56%) said a priest visits in their home once per year or less, 11 (26%) said twice to five times per year, and five (12%) said once per month or more; three (7%) did not answer the question. In the

14 group, 16 (47%) said a priest visits in their home once per year or less, ten (29%) said twice to eight times per year, and seven (21%) said once per month or more; one (3%) did not answer this question. It should be remembered that all of the subjects from both schools have had considerable contact with priests in their school life, the seminarians being taught almost exclusively by priests and the high school students being taught many of their courses by priests.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS

Question One

Table 27 gives the proportion scores obtained from each group's collective ratings about the similarity between each of the fourteen occupations and the work of the priest, and the significant and near significant Chi^2 probabilities found from comparing the groups' raw scores with one another. The proportion scores are taken to be rough representative indexes of the collective opinions of each group about the similarity of the named occupations to the priest's work. It should be emphasized that these proportion scores were not used to compute differences between groups, but are given solely for the purpose of providing the reader with a single index for comparing the collective opinions of the four groups of subjects. Differences between groups were computed directly from the raw scores of each group with the use of the Chi^2 technique. Thus a significant difference between two groups as reported here is essentially a distributional difference. Finally, such distributional differences can be broken down into two kinds: non-directional and directional differences (see chapter IV, pp.90-92).

In looking at table 27, it should be remembered that a p of 1.00 is equivalent to all X scores, and a p of .00 is equivalent to all Z scores. Scores between .00 and 1.00 represent various degrees of departure from these two extremes. However, identical p scores which are not .00 or 1.00 do not necessarily

indicate identical distributions of scores; thus a p of .50 could be due to all Y scores, or to no Y scores but an equal number of X and Z scores, or to any number of Y scores plus equally balanced numbers of X and Z scores. Hence the p score is not sensitive to all distributional differences, but only to directional distributional differences. Also, the p score is sensitive to a few extreme scores which are relatively far removed from the main body of scores. For example, two groups may have mostly X scores on an item of question one, but one of them could have a few Z scores while the other did not have any Z scores. The group with the Z scores might have a p that appears to be much lower than the p of the group with no Z scores, yet the Chi^2 may show no significant difference. This is because the Chi^2 is not as sensitive to the extreme scores as is the p score. Hence it should be remembered that differences of a certain magnitude between p scores cannot automatically be assumed to represent significant Chi^2 differences between the distributions of scores made by the two groups being compared. The p score merely helps the reader to grasp more quickly and easily the pattern of significant or near significant directional differences between groups. With the above things in mind we will now proceed to an item by item analysis of scores.

Item a: All the groups tended to see the architect as having little or no similarity to the priest, though this was more marked for both senior groups. Hence significant differences were found between the S1 group and both senior groups, and between the L1 and L4 groups; a near significant difference was found between the L1 and S4 groups.

Item b: All groups tended to see the business man as having some similarity to the priest, though the S1 group tended to see it as less similar to the

Table 27

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION ONE

Item	Proportion Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 1 and L 4				Groups L 1 and S 1				Groups L 1 and S 4			
	L 1 (N=42)	L 4 (N=34)	S 1 (N=36)	S 4 (N=31)	Chi ²	df	P	Rated As MORE Similar	Chi ²	df	P	Rated As MORE Similar	Chi ²	df	P	Rated As MORE Similar
a	.24	.13	.27	.12	3.98	1	.05	L 1	--				2.99	1	.10	L 1
b	.51	.50	.39	.49	--				2.77	1	.10	L 1	11.25	1	.001	-
c	.95	.97	1.00	1.00	--				--				--			
d	.59	.80	.77	.73	6.22	2	.05	L 4	4.74	2	.10	-	--			
e	.16	.09	.16	.03	--				--				5.23	1	.05	L 1
f	.38	.46	.32	.28	--				--				--			
g	.61	.58	.38	.53	--				9.49	2	.01	L 1	--			
h	.45	.54	.43	.44	4.54	1	.05	L 4	7.73	2	.05	-	--			
i	.53	.56	.46	.53	5.84	2	.10	-	--				--			
j	.67	.71	.75	.70	--				--				--			
k	.29	.22	.13*	.07	--				4.60	1	.05	L 1	10.33	1	.01	L 1
l	.43	.68	.45	.44	6.40	2	.05	L 4	--				--			
m	.61	.61	.54	.24	--				--				15.84	2	.001	L 1
n	.95	.94	.84	.87	--				--				--			
All	.53	.55	.49	.46	2.12	1	.20	L 4	4.21	1	.05	L 1	7.47	2	.05	L 1

* On this item N=35.

Table 27 (Continued)

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION ONE

Item	Proportion Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 4 and S 1				Groups L 4 and S 4				Groups S 1 and S 4			
	L 1 (N=42)	L 4 (N=34)	S 1 (N=36)	S 4 (N=31)	Chi ²	df	P	Rated As MORE Similar	Chi ²	df	P	Rated As MORE Similar	Chi ²	df	P	Rated As MORE Similar
a	.24	.13	.27	.12	6.37	1	.02	S 1	--				5.13	1	.05	S 1
b	.51	.50	.39	.49	3.94	1	.05	L 4	6.01	1	.02	-	10.09	1	.01	S 4
c	.95	.97	1.00	1.00	--				--				--			
d	.59	.80	.77	.73	--				--				--			
e	.16	.09	.16	.03	--				--				2.96	1	.10	S 1
f	.38	.46	.32	.28	--				3.30	1	.10	L 4	--			
g	.61	.58	.38	.53	3.73	1	.10	L 4	--				--			
h	.45	.54	.43	.44	--				4.15	1	.05	L 4	6.47	2	.05	-
i	.53	.56	.46	.53	3.54	1	.10	L 4	--				--			
j	.67	.71	.75	.70	--				--				--			
k	.29	.22	.13*	.07	--				3.19	1	.10	L 4	--			
l	.43	.68	.45	.44	3.55	1	.10	L 4	9.15	2	.02	L 4	--			
m	.61	.61	.54	.24	--				13.85	2	.001	L 4	10.03	2	.01	S 1
n	.95	.94	.84	.87	--				--				--			
All	.53	.55	.49	.46	6.54	2	.05	L 4	14.93	2	.001	L 4	3.71	1	.10	S 1

* On this item N=35.

priesthood than did the other groups. Hence significant directional differences were found between group S1 and both senior groups, and a near significant directional difference between the two freshmen groups. Moreover, significant non-directional differences were found between the S4 group and both lay groups; this is because the S4 group was almost perfectly unanimous in checking category Y, whereas the other groups checked categories X and Z significantly more often than did the S4 group.

Item c: All groups agreed almost unanimously that the work of the priest and the counselor are very similar.

Item d: All groups tended to see the doctor's work as quite similar to that of the priest, though the L4 group saw it as significantly more similar than did the L1 group.

Item e: All groups tended to see the work of the engineer as having little or no similarity to the work of the priest. The S4 group saw it as significantly less similar than did the L1 group, and nearly significantly less similar than did the S1 group.

Item f: The foreman was seen by all groups as having little to some similarity to the priest. There were no significant differences between groups.

Item g: All the groups tended to see the judge as having some similarity to the priest. However, the L1 group saw the judge as significantly more similar than did the S1 group, and the L4 group showed the same directional difference over the S1 group to a nearly significant degree. Hence the S1 group sees the priest as less similar to the judge than do both lay groups.

Item h: All groups see the lawyer as having some similarity to the priest. However, the L4 group saw the lawyer as significantly more similar than did the

L1 and S4 groups. And the S1 group was significantly less unanimous (non-directional differences) in this than were both the L1 and S4 groups.

Item i: All groups tended to see the manager as having some similarity to the priest. There were no directional differences between groups, but there was one significant non-directional difference: the L1 group was less unanimous than the S4 group. The same kind of difference was found comparing the L1 to the L4 group, but this only approached statistical significance.

Item j: All groups tended to see the priest as similar to the professor and there were no differences between groups.

Item k: All groups tended to see the scientist as having little similarity to the priest, but this was more marked for the seminarian groups. Thus the L1 group saw significantly greater similarity than did both the S1 and S4 groups, and the L4 group saw greater similarity than did the S4 group to a nearly significant degree. When the two lay groups were compared as a whole with the two seminarian groups as a whole, a Chi^2 significant at the .01 level was found.

Item l: The L4 group saw more similarity between the priest and the salesman than did all the other groups; this difference was significant with the L1 and S4 groups, and near significance with the S1 group. So the L4 group saw definite similarity, whereas the other groups saw only some similarity to this occupation.

Item m: Whereas all the other groups saw the soldier as having some similarity to the priest, the S4 group tended to see little or no similarity. Hence the S4 group saw significantly less similarity than did all the other groups.

Item n: All the groups tended to see great similarity between the teacher

and priest, and there were no significant inter-group differences.

In reviewing the overall trends of differences between the four groups on question one, it can be seen from table 27 that the tendency is for the seminarians to see the priest as less similar to other occupations than do the lay groups, and that this tendency is more marked between the two senior groups.

To determine the significance of these suggested overall differences among the groups, Chi^2 scores were computed for the summation of the groups' answers to all the items on question one. Statistically significant differences were found in four of the six group comparisons: the L1 group differed at the .05 level of confidence from both seminarian groups; and the L4 group differed from the S1 group at the .05 level, and from the S4 group at the .001 level. In all instances the lay groups tended to see significantly more similarity between the priest's work and that of the other occupations named in the questionnaire. This difference apparently increases with age and years of education. Thus the L4 group tended to see greater overall similarity than the L1 group, though this was only at the .20 level of confidence. And the S1 group tended to see greater overall similarity than the S4 group, but only at the .10 level of probability.

Question One-Ranking (1R)

The same general approach as that developed for question one was used for reporting the results found for question 1R, which are given in table 28. However, mean rank scores were used instead of the proportion scores used for question one; and of course the Chi^2 tests were based on the frequency scores of the various ranks assigned to each occupation by the groups, or combinations thereof. So these frequency scores are the raw scores upon which both the Mean Rank score and the Chi^2 computations are based for each item of the question.

And just as for question one, the presence of extreme scores might result in greater or lesser differences on the mean scores without this being necessarily reflected in the significance level of the Chi^2 computations.

It will be noted that with fourteen potential frequency categories there is a possibility that Chi^2 tables can be made to have several degrees of freedom. Also that depending on how much combining of contiguous categories is done, the experimenter can do Chi^2 's having different degrees of freedom, or even different Chi^2 's having the same degrees of freedom (by using the same number of categories with different cutting points). Because of this the experimenter often did more than one Chi^2 for each comparison, until it was clear that if there was a Chi^2 showing a significant or near-significant directional difference, it had been found for any two groups on a given item.

Item a: The seminarian groups tended to rank the architect as more similar to the priest than did the lay groups. Thus the S1 group ranked it significantly more similar than did both lay groups, and the S4 group significantly more similar than did the I4 group. No other significant differences were found.

With reflection one can see that the results of ranking the occupations for their similarity to the priesthood will not necessarily be the same as the results found in the first part of question one. This is because question one allows the subject to make an independent rating of each occupation's similarity, whereas question 1R requires more of a comparative judgment about the similarity of each occupation (i.e. compared to the similarity of all the other occupations named). Any group which tends to see the work of the priest as generally not similar to the work of the other occupations would tend to

Table 28

MEAN RANK SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION ONE-R

Item	Mean Rank Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 1 and L 4				Groups L 1 and S 1				Groups L 1 and S 4			
	L 1 (N=40)	L 4 (N=33)	S 1 (N=36)	S 4 (N=31)	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Similar	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Similar	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Similar
a	11.05	11.58	9.69	10.94	--				3.85	1	.05	S 1	--			
b	8.50	8.45	8.36	6.97	--				10.07	4	.05	-	6.52	1	.02	S 4
c	2.00	2.18	1.64	1.48	--				6.82	2	.05	-	11.00	2	.01	S 4
d	5.67	5.21	4.72	4.42	--				--				--			
e	11.27	12.24	10.94	11.87	8.07	3	.05	L 1	--				--			
f	9.07	9.70	9.14	9.65	--				--				6.25	2	.05	-
g	5.65	7.45	8.64	6.65	8.09	1	.01	L 1	20.56	4	.001	L 1	--			
h	8.27	7.58	8.44	7.77	--				--				--			
i	8.10	7.64	7.83	6.77	--				--				5.50	1	.02	S 4
j	6.37	6.24	5.39	5.58	10.01	2	.01	-	3.44	1	.10	S 1	7.24	2	.05	-
k	11.27	10.91	11.28	12.39	3.00	1	.10	L 4	--				4.78	1	.05	L 1
l	8.55	6.45	8.39	7.65	3.84	1	.05	L 4	--				5.51	2	.10	-
m	6.65	6.82	7.11	10.06	--				--				17.01	4	.01	L 1
n	2.57	2.54	3.42	2.81	--				3.93	1	.05	L 1	3.72	1	.10	L 1

Table 28 (Continued)

MEAN RANK SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION ONE-R

Item	Mean Rank Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 4 and S 1				Groups L 4 and S 4				Groups S 1 and S 4			
	L 1 (N=40)	L 4 (N=33)	S 1 (N=36)	S 4 (N=31)	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Similar	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Similar	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Similar
a	11.05	11.58	9.69	10.94	10.04	4	.05	S 1	3.96	1	.05	S 4	--			
b	8.50	8.45	8.36	6.97	12.61	4	.02	-	3.87	1	.05	S 4	11.12	2	.01	S 4
c	2.00	2.18	1.64	1.48	--				7.15	2	.05	S 4	--			
d	5.67	5.21	4.72	4.42	--				--				--			
e	11.27	12.24	10.94	11.87	7.96	3	.05	S 1	--				--			
f	9.07	9.70	9.14	9.65	--				--				--			
g	5.65	7.45	8.64	6.65	--				4.00	1	.05	S 4	11.34	4	.05	S 4
h	8.27	7.58	8.44	7.77	--				--				--			
i	8.10	7.64	7.83	6.77	--				8.78	3	.05	S 4	4.70	1	.05	S 4
j	6.37	6.24	5.39	5.58	4.29	1	.05	S 1	8.71	3	.05	S 4	--			
k	11.27	10.91	11.28	12.39	--				11.05	4	.05	L 4	3.27	1	.10	S 1
l	8.55	6.45	8.39	7.65	5.20	1	.05	L 4	4.11	1	.05	L 4	6.28	3	.10	-
m	6.65	6.82	7.11	10.06	--				12.18	4	.02	L 4	12.14	4	.02	S 1
n	2.57	2.54	3.42	2.81	3.77	1	.10	L 4	--						.02 ^f	S 4

f Using Fisher's exact probability test.

disagree always in the same direction from another group which tends to see the priest's work as generally more similar. But if both groups are asked to rank the other occupations' similarity to the priesthood, then each member of each group has to assign a rank of "1" to some occupation; and they may agree which occupation is most like the work of the priest (has the greatest relative similarity) without having to agree about the degree of similarity that it has independently of any comparisons with other occupations. The significance of this difference between questions one and 1R will be discussed further after the rest of the items for question 1R have been reported individually.

Item b: The S4 group ranked the business man significantly more similar to the priest than did all the other groups. The S1 group's rankings tended to have a bimodal distribution, hence there were significant non-directional differences between it and both lay groups.

Item c: While all groups clearly ranked counselor as the occupation most similar to the priesthood, there were still significant differences in the distributions of ranks. Thus the S4 group ranked it significantly more similar than did both lay groups. The only other significant difference was non-directional between the S1 and L1 groups.

Item d: There were no significant differences in the group rankings of the doctor's similarity to the priest, which was ranked quite high by all groups.

Item e: All the groups tended to rank the engineer relatively low in its similarity to the priesthood. The L4 group did this most strongly, and thus ranked it significantly less similar than did both freshmen groups.

Item f: Only one significant difference was found among the groups in their ranking of foreman; this difference, between the L1 and S4 groups, was

not directional but tended to show significantly less variability in the S₄ group. That is, the I₁ group had more extreme ranks and fewer middle ranks than did the S₄ group.

Item g: The ranking results for the similarity of the judge to the priest show that both the I₁ and S₄ groups ranked it significantly more similar than did both the I₄ and S₁ groups.

Item h: No significant differences were found among the groups in their rankings of the lawyer's similarity, which all groups tended to rank at a medium to low level of relative similarity.

Item i: The S₄ group ranked manager as significantly less similar than did all of the other groups, whose rankings were in the medium to high range. There were no other significant differences.

Item j: The I₄ group ranked professor as significantly less similar than did both seminarian groups. Also, the I₁ group showed significant non-directional differences from all the other groups in that the I₁ group had more extreme rankings and fewer middle ranks. All groups ranked professor relatively high in its degree of similarity to the priest.

Item k: The S₄ group ranked scientist as less similar than did all other groups; this was significant with both lay groups and nearly significant with the S₁ group. Also the I₄ group ranked scientist more similar than did the I₁ group to a near significant degree. All groups ranked scientist very low in similarity, it should be noted.

Item l: The I₄ group ranked the salesman as significantly more similar to the priest than did all the other groups. Also, the S₄ group had fewer extreme scores than did both freshman groups to a near significant degree. Except by

the L₁ group, salesman was ranked rather low in similarity.

Item m: The S₄ group ranked soldier as significantly less similar than did all the other groups, which ranked it in the medium to high range of relative similarity.

Item n: The S₁ group tended to rank teacher as less similar to the priest than did the other groups; this difference was significant with respect to the L₁ and S₄ groups (using the Fisher test of exact probability in the comparison with the latter), and nearly significant with respect to the L₁ group. The L₁ group ranked the teacher as more similar than did the S₄ group to a near significant degree.

No overall trends of differences can be computed for question 1R as was done for question one. This is because all the groups had to give one of each rank for each item, so that the scores for each item are interdependent on one another. Hence, since the measures for the different items are not independent of one another they cannot be combined validly to do a Chi^2 analysis. Even if one attempted this the Chi^2 's would all be zero, since every rank would have a frequency of n for each group and there would be no difference between the observed and expected frequencies.

Comparisons Between Results of Questions One and 1R

Some comparison between questions one and 1R are in order, however. One can see that the comparisons among groups yield a different set of results when based on the data of question one as distinguished from that of question 1R. This is in part a logical necessity stemming from the nature of the scores obtained with the two different approaches. Thus, every time group A ranks an occupation significantly more similar to the priesthood than does group B, the

probability necessarily is greater that some other occupation will be ranked more similar by group B. This need not be so in question one because the ratings for each occupation can be made independently of one another. A look at the number of directional differences between each set of groups for questions one and 1R bears this out.

There are four significant directional differences between the L4 groups on question one. The L4 group rated three of these—doctor, lawyer, and salesman—as more similar to the priest than did the L1 group. The L1 group rated only the architect as more similar than did the L4 group. On question 1R, however, the L4 group ranked only the salesman as significantly more similar; and a completely different occupation from any of the above, the scientist, as more similar to a near significant degree. On question 1R the L1 group ranked two occupations as significantly more similar than did the L4 group; these two occupations, engineer and judge, do not include the one occupation (architect) rated by the L1 group in question one as more similar.

All the directional differences between the L1 and S1 groups on question one found the L1 group rating other occupations as more similar to the priesthood than did the S1 group. Thus judge and scientist were seen as more similar to a significant degree, and business man to a near significant degree. On question 1R the L1 group ranked judge and teacher as significantly more similar, but the S1 group ranked architect as significantly more similar.

The directional differences between the L1 and S4 groups on question one all found the L1 group seeing greater similarity between the priesthood and other occupations. Thus counselor, scientist and soldier were rated more similar to a significant degree, and architect to a near significant degree. On

question 1R the I1 group ranked scientist and soldier as more similar to a significant degree, and teacher to a near significant degree. At the same time the S4 group ranked three occupations as more similar than did the I1 group: business man, counselor, and manager. In the case of the similarity between priest and counselor, we see apparently opposite results occurring between the I1 and S4 groups. The I1 group rates counselor as significantly more similar, yet the S4 group ranks counselor as significantly more similar. The explanation suggested by this contrast is that the ranking approach does not give as independent or absolute an indication of a group's opinion about the similarity between the priesthood and any other occupation. Thus: the S4 group does not consider the counselor to be as similar to the priesthood as does the I1 group; but the S4 group sees relatively greater similarity between the counselor and priest than between the priest and other occupations (i.e. when this similarity is considered relative to that of the other occupations listed in the question).

There were five directional differences found between the S1 and I4 groups on question one. The S1 group rated architect as significantly more similar than did the I4 group. The I4 group rated business man as significantly more similar; and judge, manager and salesman as more similar to a near significant degree. In question 1R, however, the S1 group ranked architect, engineer and professor as significantly more similar than did the I4 group. And the I4 group ranked salesman as more similar to a significant degree, and teacher to a near significant degree.

All five of the directional differences between the two senior groups on question one revealed a tendency for the I4 group to see other occupations as more similar to the priesthood than did the S4 group. The I4 group rated lawyer

salesman and soldier as significantly more similar, and foreman and scientist as more similar to a near significant degree. On question 1R, however, the S₄ group ranked no less than six occupations as significantly more similar to the priest than did the L₄ group: architect, business man, counselor, judge, manager and professor. The L₄ group ranked scientist, salesman and soldier as significantly more similar.

It is in comparing these two groups that the contrast between questions one and 1R is most apparent. Clearly on the basis of independent ratings, the S₄ group tends to see less similarity between the priesthood and other occupations than does the L₄ group. This is borne out by the summation χ^2 score done on their results from question one ($P = .001$). Yet when the S₄ group is forced to make an assumption that all the occupations have some similarity—to a relatively greater or lesser degree—then we find the group seeing greater relative similarity for six occupations.

There were four directional differences between the S₁ and S₄ groups on question one. The S₁ group rated architect and soldier as significantly more similar, and engineer as more similar to a near significant degree. The S₄ group rated business man as significantly more similar. On question 1R, however, the S₁ group ranked only soldier as significantly more similar than did the S₄ group, and scientist as more similar to a near significant degree. And the S₄ group ranked business man, judge, manager and teacher as significantly more similar than did the S₁ group.

These comparisons between the groups show at least one definite pattern; namely, that the S₄ group tends to rate all other occupations as less similar to the priesthood than do the other groups; yet when ranking the other

occupations for their similarity to the priesthood, the Sh group tends to see more instances of greater relative similarity between certain occupations and the priesthood—most notably the occupations of business man and manager, and to a definite degree those of counselor and judge. (See table 28.) One possible explanation for this pattern is that the Sh group has a stronger and clearer opinion about the work of the priest in relation to other occupations than do the other groups used in this study. One might expect this in view of the fact that they alone among the four groups have spent four years preparing themselves for doing priestly work. They appear from question one to have a stronger opinion that the work of the priest is different from that of other occupations, yet from question 18 they appear to have clearer ideas about which other occupations have relatively greater similarity to the priesthood when these occupations must be compared among themselves as to their degree of similarity. This same pattern appears to exist even for the first year seminarians when they are compared to the lay groups, though it is not so marked as with the Sh group.

Lest the reader leave with the impression that there are great discrepancies between the rating and ranking results—and this despite the fact they were done in full view of one another—a final comparison should be mentioned for comparative rank scores developed for each group from the two parts of question one. Thus, for each group the ranks of the proportion scores were contrasted with the ranks of the mean rank scores. The Rho's computed for the sets of data from each group are very high (.96 or above), and all have a probability of .01 or less that they could be due to chance factors.

Finally, Rho's were run between the ranks of the proportion scores for

each group. These Rho's are high (.85 to .94), and all show a probability of .01 or less that they could be due to chance. These ranking results show that all the groups tended to agree about the relative similarity of various occupations to the priesthood. They do not show the tendency of seminarians, especially the fourth year group, to see less general similarity between other occupations and the priesthood.

Question Two

Table 29 gives proportion scores obtained from each group's collective ratings of how desirable they thought it was for a priest to have each of the seventeen qualities listed in question two. On the right side of table 29 are given the Chi^2 's, degrees of freedom and probabilities of any inter-group difference which is significant or nearly so. Like the results given for question one, it should be remembered that the Chi^2 's were computed from the raw scores and not from the proportion scores, which are given as representative indexes of each group's collective opinion. The proportion scores are based on assigning a score of three to all "A" answers ("very desirable"), a score of two to all "B" answers ("desirable"), a score of one to all "C" answers ("slightly desirable"), and a score of zero to all "D" answers ("not necessarily desirable"); then these scores were summed for each group and divided by 3N.

In looking over the raw score frequencies, it was readily seen that three rating categories would have been sufficient for question two. Thus category D "Not Necessarily Desirable", was just that; it was used only to a negligible degree on all but item 1, "Persuasiveness", which was the only instance in which a Chi^2 table with more than two df could be set up. The subjects saw all of the qualities or virtues given in question two as being positive, as shown

by the fact that there was only one proportion score below .50 in all of table 29. Hence these results show clearly that three rating categories are sufficient for this kind of question so long as the subjects are being asked to give their opinions about positive qualities only. In the event an experimenter would wish to list negative as well as positive qualities for question two, then the use of five rating categories would probably be most suitable.

In reporting χ^2 probabilities table 29 applies to question two in the same way as table 27 applies to question one; and the same assumptions and terminology will be used as for question one.

Item a: All groups tended to rate ability to give up comfort as a desirable quality for the priest to have, though the S₄ group more so than the others. Thus the S₄ group rated this quality as significantly more desirable than did the L₁ and S₁ groups.

Item b: All groups rated cheerfulness as a desirable to very desirable quality, but this was more marked in the two seminary groups. Thus the S₄ group rated it as significantly more desirable than did both lay groups, and the S₁ group rated it as more desirable than did the L₁ group to a nearly significant degree.

Item c: All the groups rated courage as very desirable to desirable with no inter-group differences.

Item d: All the groups rated Hope in God as very desirable.

Item e: All groups rated humility as desirable to very desirable, but the seminary groups rated it as more desirable than did the lay groups. The S₁ group rated humility as significantly more desirable than did both lay groups. The S₄ group rated humility significantly more desirable than did the L₁ group,

Table 29

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION TWO

Item	Proportion Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 1 and L 4				Groups L 1 and S 1				Groups L 1 and S 4			
	L 1	L 4	S 1	S 4	Chi ²	df	P	Rated As	Chi ²	df	P	Rated As	Chi ²	df	P	Rated As
	(N=43)	(N=34)	(N=36)	(N=31)				MORE Desirable				MORE Desirable				MORE Desirable
a	.74	.62	.73	.86	--				--				--			
b	.77	.74	.85	.89	--				--				3.93	1	.05	S 4
c	.88	.86	.87	.86	--				--				--			
d	.97	.97	.97	.97	--				--				--			
e	.74	.77	.89	.90	--				7.17	1	.01	S 1	6.02	1	.02	S 4
f	.61	.73	.61	.72	5.53	2	.10	L 4	--				--			
g	.80	.85	.92	.94	--				6.71	1	.01	S 1	9.08	1	.01	S 4
h	.84	.88	.90	.86	--				--				--			
i	.40	.67	.50	.67	13.20	3	.01	L 4	--				15.24	2	.001	S 4
j	.53	.62	.62	.71	5.27	2	.10	L 4	--				9.27	2	.01	S 4
k	.78	.80	.79	.84	--				--				--			
l	.59	.60	.61	.74	--				--				6.14	2	.05	S 4
m	.88	.94	.82	.92	2.98	1	.10	L 4	--				--			
n	.75	.76	.71	.86	--				5.62	2	.10	-	3.22	1	.10	S 4
o	.88	.91	.86	.96	--				--				2.72	1	.10	S 4
p	.83	.87	.85	.94	--				--				--			
q	.83	.80	.94	.92	--				5.14	1	.05	S 1	--			
All	.76	.79	.79	.86	4.94	2	.10	L 4	8.71	3	.05	S 1	52.25	3	.001	S 4

Table 29 (Continued)

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION TWO

Item	Proportion Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 4 and S 1				Groups L 4 and S 4				Groups S 1 and S 4			
	L 1	L 4	S 1	S 4	Chi ²	df	Rated As		Chi ²	df	Rated As		Chi ²	df	Rated As	
	(N=43)	(N=34)	(N=36)	(N=31)			P	MORE Desirable			P	MORE Desirable			P	MORE Desirable
a	.74	.62	.73	.86	--				11.40	2	.01	S 4	4.44	1	.05	S 4
b	.77	.74	.85	.89	2.81	1	.10	S 1	5.69	1	.02	S 4	--			
c	.88	.86	.87	.86	--				--				--			
d	.97	.97	.97	.97	--				--				--			
e	.74	.77	.89	.90	4.56	1	.05	S 1	3.73	1	.10	S 4	--			
f	.61	.73	.61	.72	5.48	2	.10	L 4	--				4.96	2	.10	S 4
g	.80	.85	.92	.94	--				2.96	1	.10	S 4	--			
h	.84	.88	.90	.86	--				--				--			
i	.40	.67	.50	.67	6.73	2	.05	L 4	--				5.91	2	.10	S 4
j	.53	.62	.62	.71	--				--				4.74	2	.10	S 4
k	.78	.80	.79	.84	--				--				--			
l	.59	.60	.61	.74	--				6.90	2	.05	S 4	6.48	2	.05	S 4
m	.88	.94	.82	.92	4.95	1	.05	L 4	--				--			
n	.75	.76	.71	.86	--				--				6.23	2	.05	S 4
o	.88	.91	.86	.96	--				--				--			
p	.83	.87	.85	.94	--				--				2.86	1	.10	S 4
q	.83	.80	.94	.92	5.36	1	.05	S 1	--				--			
All	.76	.79	.79	.86	--				25.34	2	.001	S 4	30.48	2	.001	S 4

and nearly significantly more desirable than did the L4 group (probability just above .05).

Item f: Intelligence was rated only in the desirable range, and the seniors tended to see it as slightly more desirable than did the freshmen. Thus the L4 group rated it more desirable than did both freshmen groups, and the S4 group more desirable than did the L1 group—though all to only a near significant degree.

Item g: Patience with others was rated very desirable to desirable by all the groups; but the seminary groups rated it as significantly more desirable than did the L1 group, and the S4 group as more desirable than did the L4 group to a near significant degree.

Item h: All groups rated perseverance as very desirable to desirable with no inter-group differences.

Item i: The two senior groups rated persuasiveness in the desirable range, whereas the two freshmen groups—especially the L1's—tended to rate it toward the slightly desirable level. Thus the L4 group rated it significantly more desirable than did both freshmen groups, and the same for the S4 group over the L1 group. The S4 group rated it more desirable than did the S1 group to a near significant degree (the probability being slightly above .05).

Item j: Politeness was rated desirable to slightly desirable. The S4 group rated it highest and the L1 group lowest to show the only significant difference between groups. Also the S4 group rated it more desirable than did the S1 group, and the L4 group than the L1 group, both to a near significant degree.

Item k: All groups rated respect for people as desirable to very desirable; there were no inter-group differences.

Item l: The S₄ group rated a sense of humor as desirable, whereas the other three groups rated it significantly less desirable.

Item m: All the groups rated sincerity as very desirable to desirable. The L₄ group rated it higher than did both freshmen groups; this was significant over the S₁ group and nearly significant over the L₁ group.

Item n: All the groups rated tolerance as somewhat above the desirable level. The S₄ group rated it highest, to a significant degree over the S₁ group and a near significant degree over the L₁ group. There was also a near significant non-directional difference between the two freshmen groups showing a tendency for the S₁ group to be less unanimous than the L₁ group.

Item o: All the groups rated understanding as very desirable to desirable. There were no significant inter-group differences, though the S₄ group rated it more desirable than did the L₁ group to a near significant degree. The proportion scores suggested that the two senior groups rated understanding higher than did the freshmen, but a χ^2 between all seniors and all freshmen was not significant.

Item p: All the groups rated will power as desirable to very desirable; the only group difference was that the S₄ group rated it higher than did the S₁ group to a near significant degree.

Item q: The lay groups rated zeal as desirable to very desirable whereas the seminarians rated it very desirable to desirable. The only significant inter-group differences were between the S₁ and both lay groups, however. When the two seminarian groups combined were compared with the two lay groups combined, a χ^2 of 7.50 was obtained for one df—a significant difference with a probability of .01 or less.

Since the ratings of each quality in question two were made independently of one another, it is possible to compare the group ratings made for all the items combined. When this was done it was clearly shown that the S₄ group's ratings for the qualities listed were significantly higher than the ratings of the other three groups. So the fourth year seminarians saw the qualities listed as generally more desirable for a priest to have than did the other groups. This trend is very marked as reflected in the mean p scores for all the items shown in table 29. Also noteworthy is the fact that all the significant and near significant differences between the S₄ group and the other groups on the items of question two always showed the S₄ group seeing the quality in question as more desirable for a priest to have.

For the group comparisons on the items of question two as a whole only one other significant difference was found. The S₁ group's ratings were significantly higher than the ratings of the I₁ group. The I₄ group's combined ratings also were higher than those of the I₁ group; but this was only to a near significant degree with two df, and it should be noted that the difference was not statistically significant when computed for one df and three df.

Thus the S₄ group appears to idealize the priesthood more than do the other groups, having a stronger conviction about the desirability for priests to have good qualities such as those listed in question two. This tendency in fourth year seminarians is also found to a degree in the first year seminarians when they are compared with their non-seminarian peers. Since the combined group ratings on question two showed no significant difference between the S₁ and I₄ groups, and since the S₄ group gave a combined rating which was significantly higher than that of the S₁ group, and in view of the tendency toward

significance of the I_4 group's combined ratings over those of the I_1 group, there seems to be a tendency for adolescent boys to increase their opinion as they grow older about the degree to which good qualities (such as those given in question two) are seen as desirable for priests to have.

In summary, minor seminarians show greater conviction than their non-seminarian peers about the desirability of good qualities in priests—especially such qualities as cheerfulness, humility, patience with others, and zeal. Secondly there was a tendency for such conviction to show an increase with age in both the seminarian and non-seminarian groups; those qualities which tended to show this age difference most clearly were intelligence, persuasiveness and politeness.

Question 2R

The discussion given for question 1R prior to the item-by-item discussion applies in toto to question 2R, and will not be repeated here except to say that the same approach and assumptions are used for question 2R as were used for question 1R. Table 30 gives the results of the mean ranks and inter-group differences for the items of question 2R.

Item a: The I_4 group ranked ability to give up comfort as significantly less desirable for a priest to have than did all the other groups. The only other significant difference was between the I_1 and S_4 groups, but it was not clearly directional; thus both groups showed a somewhat bi-modal distribution of ranks with the peaks of the I_1 group occurring at lower rank levels than did the corresponding higher and lower peaks of the S_4 group. So from the use of the Chi^2 technique no overall directional difference can be assumed.

Item b: The I_4 group ranked cheerfulness as significantly less desirable

Table 30

MEAN RANK SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION TWO-R

Item	<u>Mean Rank Scores</u>				<u>Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:</u>											
	<u>In Group:</u>				<u>Groups L 1 and L 4</u>				<u>Groups L 1 and S 1</u>				<u>Groups L 1 and S 4</u>			
	L 1 (N=38)	L 4 (N=22)	S 1 (N=33)	S 4 (N=28)	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Desir- able	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Desir- able	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Desir- able
a	9.45	13.82	10.55	10.39	17.25	3	.001	L 1	--				8.29	3	.05	-
b	8.66	11.64	9.70	9.68	13.78	1	.001	L 1	--				--			
c	5.79	6.86	7.09	9.43	--				4.94	1	.05	L 1	12.23	2	.01	L 1
d	3.03	3.05	3.18	4.43	--				--				6.76	2	.05	L 1
e	9.08	8.91	4.70	6.46	--				18.09	5	.01	S 1	3.61	1	.10	S 4
f	10.58	9.00	12.15	12.13	3.86	1	.05	L 4	4.67	1	.05	L 1	5.26	1	.05	L 1
g	8.84	7.91	7.09	7.04	--				4.67	1	.05	S 1	3.71	1	.10	S 4
h	6.95	6.73	7.24	8.96	--				--				4.95	1	.05	L 1
i	14.08	11.82	14.76	14.00	5.82	1	.02	L 4	--				--			
j	14.00	13.23	13.15	14.04	--				--				5.70	2	.10	-
k	9.32	8.59	9.09	8.61	--				--				--			
l	12.18	12.50	12.52	13.25	--				--				--			
m	7.61	6.77	8.94	7.07	--				7.35	2	.05	-	--			
n	10.55	11.14	10.79	8.82	--				--				8.21	3	.05	S 4
o	6.66	5.05	7.55	5.36	--				--				--			
p	8.16	8.68	8.52	7.79	--				--				--			
q	8.08	7.32	6.00	5.61	--				6.87	1	.01	S 1	4.10	1	.05	S 4

Table 30 (Continued)

MEAN RANK SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION TWO-R

Item	Mean Rank Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 4 and S 1				Groups L 4 and S 4				Groups S 1 and S 4			
	L 1 (N=38)	L 4 (N=22)	S 1 (N=33)	S 4 (N=28)	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Desir- able	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Desir- able	Chi ²	df	P	Ranked As MORE Desir- able
a	9.45	13.82	10.55	10.39	10.46	3	.02	S 1	8.54	2	.02	S 4	--			
b	8.66	11.64	9.70	9.68	3.39	1	.10	S 1	--				--			
c	5.79	6.86	7.09	9.43	--				4.39	1	.05	L 4	5.60	1	.02	S 1
d	3.03	3.05	3.18	4.43	--				4.86	2	.10	L 4	5.03	2	.10	-
e	9.08	8.91	4.70	6.46	11.56	3	.01	S 1	3.25	1	.10	S 4	3.22	1	.10	S 1
f	10.58	9.00	12.15	12.13	8.99	2	.02	L 4	6.87	2	.05	L 4	--			
g	8.84	7.91	7.09	7.04	5.03	2	.10	-	--				--			
h	6.95	6.73	7.24	8.96	--				6.63	2	.05	L 4	3.26	1	.10	S 1
i	14.08	11.82	14.76	14.00	10.18	3	.02	L 4	7.05	2	.05	L 4	--			
j	14.00	13.23	13.15	14.04	--				--				--			
k	9.32	8.59	9.09	8.61	--				--				--			
l	12.18	12.50	12.52	13.25	--				--				--			
m	7.61	6.77	8.94	7.07	3.09	1	.10	L 4	--				3.58	1	.10	S 4
n	10.55	11.14	10.79	8.82	--				2.74	1	.10	S 4	4.67	1	.05	S 4
o	6.66	5.05	7.55	5.36	7.00	2	.05	L 4	--				4.50	1	.05	S 4
p	8.16	8.68	8.52	7.79	--				--				--			
q	8.08	7.32	6.00	5.61	--		.08 ^f	S 1	--				--			

f Using Fisher's exact probability test.

than did the L1 group, and less desirable than did the S1 group to a near significant degree.

Item c: The S4 group ranked courage as significantly less desirable than did all the other groups. In addition the L1 group ranked it as significantly more desirable than did the S1 group.

Item d: All the groups ranked Hope in God as the most desirable quality of those given; the L1 group ranked it as significantly more desirable than did the S4 group, however.

Item e: The seminarian groups ranked humility as more desirable than did the lay groups; this was significant between the L1 and both seminarian groups, but only near significance between the L4 and both seminarian groups. Moreover, the S1 group ranked humility as more desirable than did the S4 group to a near significant degree.

Item f: Both lay groups ranked intelligence as significantly more desirable than did both seminarian groups. Moreover, the L4 group ranked it as significantly more desirable than did the L1 group.

Item g: The L1 group ranked patience with others as more desirable than did both seminarian groups; this was significant with the S1 group but only near significance with the S4 group. A non-directional difference approaching significance was found suggesting that the L4 group had greater unanimity in its rankings than did the S1 group.

Item h: The S4 group ranked perseverance as less desirable than did all the other groups; this was significant with both lay groups, but only approaching significance with the S1 group.

Item i: The L4 group ranked persuasiveness as significantly more

desirable than did all the other groups.

Items j, k and l: There were no significant inter-group differences in the rankings of politeness, respect for people, or sense of humor.

Item m: The S1 group ranked sincerity as less desirable than did the other groups; this was significant only with the L1 group, however, and only near significance with both fourth year groups.

Item n: The S1 group ranked tolerance as more desirable than did the other groups; this was significant with both first year groups, but only near significance with the L1 group.

Item o: The S1 group ranked understanding as significantly less desirable than did both fourth year groups.

Item p: There were no significant inter-group differences in the rankings of will power.

Item q: The L1 group ranked zeal as significantly less desirable than did both seminarian groups. Moreover, using the Fisher exact probability test, the S1 group ranked zeal as more desirable than did the L1 group to a near significant degree.

As in the case of question 1R, no overall trends for question 2R as a whole can be computed (like was done for question one and two). Some comparisons are in order, however, between the results for questions two and 2R.

Comparisons Between Results of Questions Two and 2R

Thus, between the two lay groups, all the rating differences showed the L1 group seeing some qualities as more desirable for a priest to have—including persuasiveness to a significant degree and intelligence, politeness and sincerity to a nearly significant degree. The ranking differences show the L1 group

seeing intelligence and persuasiveness as relatively more desirable to a significant degree, but there are two counter-balancing differences (not suggested by the rating data) showing that the I1 group saw ability to give up comfort and cheerfulness as relatively more desirable to a significant degree.

All three directional rating differences between the two first year groups show the S1 group rating qualities as significantly more desirable for a priest to have—including humility, patience with others, and zeal. The ranking differences show the very same significant differences favoring the S1 group, but in addition there are three significant differences between the two groups in the opposite direction—showing that the I1 group ranked courage, intelligence and sincerity as more desirable for a priest to have.

All the rating differences between the I1 and S1 groups show that the S1 group rated several qualities as more desirable for a priest to have than did the I1 group—including cheerfulness, humility, patience with others, persuasiveness, politeness, and sense of humor to a significant degree, tolerance and understanding to a nearly significant degree. The ranking differences show greatly different results, however. The I1 group ranked four qualities as significantly more desirable—courage, Hope in God, intelligence and perseverance—whereas the S1 group ranked only tolerance and zeal as more desirable to a significant degree, humility and patience with others to a near significant degree.

The rating differences between the S1 and I1 groups show no uniform direction. The S1 group rated humility and zeal as more desirable to a significant degree, cheerfulness to a near significant degree; the I1 group rated persuasiveness and sincerity as more desirable to a significant degree,

intelligence to a near significant degree. The ranking differences between these two groups are greater in number but otherwise very similar. Thus the S1 group ranked ability to give up comfort and humility as more desirable to a significant degree, cheerfulness and zeal to a near significant degree; the L4 group ranked intelligence, persuasiveness and understanding as more desirable to a significant degree, sincerity to a near significant degree.

All the rating differences between the two fourth year groups show the S4 group seeing qualities as more desirable for a priest to have than did the L4 group. Thus the S4 group rated ability to give up comfort, cheerfulness and sense of humor as significantly more desirable, humility and patience with others as more desirable to a near significant degree. The ranking results show differences of the same sort only for ability to give up comfort to a significant degree, and for humility to a near significant degree; in addition, the S4 group ranked tolerance as more desirable to a near significant degree. More than counter-balancing these differences, it would seem, are differences showing that the L4 group ranked courage, intelligence, perseverance and persuasiveness as more desirable to a significant degree, Hope in God to a near significant degree.

All the rating differences between the seminarian groups showed the S4 group seeing several qualities as more desirable for a priest to have—including ability to give up comfort, sense of humor and tolerance to a significant degree, intelligence, persuasiveness, politeness, and will power to a near significant degree. The ranking differences are quite different, however, with the S4 group ranking only tolerance and understanding as more desirable to a significant degree, and sincerity to a near significant degree. And the S1 group

ranked courage as more desirable to a significant degree, Hope in God, humility, perseverance and sincerity to a near significant degree.

These findings again clearly show that the rating and ranking methods will result in different patterns of group differences, and also that the pattern found from using either approach generally will not be helpful in predicting what the pattern would be using the opposite approach. The only possible exception to the latter might be when one finds two groups that differ in their ratings of various values approximately an equal number of times in opposite directions, such as happened between the S1 and L4 groups on question two; at such times the pattern of rating differences may hold for ranking differences as well, though in the example cited additional differences in each direction appeared in the ranking results which could not have been predicted from the rating differences.

Notwithstanding the differences in the patterns of significant inter-group differences found for the rating as compared to the ranking method, the similarities between the two methods should also be noted. Thus if one wishes to find out a group's relative preference for a number of values along a particular dimension, then the two approaches can produce very similar results. The rank correlations between each group's ranks of the mean rank scores (question 2R) and ranks of the rating proportion scores (question 2) were computed. All the rho's are .90 or above, all significant at the .01 level of confidence. Moreover, the ranks of each group's proportion scores were correlated with those of every other group. These correlations are not so high, ranging from .72 to .94, yet they still are all significant at the .01 level of confidence and show that among the groups there is considerable agreement about the

relative desirability for a priest to have the traits listed in question two.

The comparative group difference patterns between question two and 2R do show that the rating data reveals something one could never tell from the ranking data, namely, that the S4 group tends to see the qualities given as more desirable for a priest to have than do the other three groups. This is shown by the fact that for all the items combined the S4 group's ratings are significantly higher than those of each other group at the .001 level of confidence and that the mean proportion score of the S4 group is higher than those of the other groups (see table 29). Every significant or near significant rating difference between the S4 group and any other group was in the direction of the S4 group seeing a quality as more desirable for a priest to have.

These results suggest that the S4 group may tend to idealize the priesthood to a greater degree than do the other groups, since all of the qualities mentioned in question two probably can be considered positive ones. Or, from a different viewpoint, perhaps the S4 group is more keenly aware of the imposing difficulties which are encountered by the priest in his work, and hence is more impressed with the desirability that the priest bring as many good qualities as possible to bear on his most important work. Whatever the reason or reasons, one can say from the data of question two that the S4 group stresses the desirability that priests have good qualities more than do the other three groups. Moreover, looking over table 29, there appears to be a less marked tendency on the part of the S1 group to do the same in comparison to the I1 group, suggesting that in part the differentiating factors operating in question two may be a function of the priestly vocation in adolescent boys. (The seminarian groups can be assumed to have more vocations than the non-seminarian

groups.) Finally, to a less marked degree, one can see some indicators to show that the I₄ group tends to stress the desirability of the qualities named more than does the I₁ group (and equally as much as does the S₁ group); this suggests that an age factor also may have an effect in determining how adolescent boys answer question two. Thus the older the Catholic adolescent boy gets, the more he is likely to stress the desirability for a priest to have good qualities.

It would be interesting to see if this suggested age trend continues after adolescence. Another interesting area to explore would be attitudes toward the undesirability of negative traits being present in the priest.

Question Three

Table 31 gives the proportion scores of the four subject groups for all the items of question three and the significant differences found from group comparisons on the items. The proportion scores were computed as for question one except that the ratings were taken to be in both a positive and negative direction, hence with five rating categories the middle (rather than lower) category was the zero point. Thus, if all the group members rated an item A, "Very Proper", then it received a p of 1.00; if all rated it B, "Proper", a p of .50; if all rated it C, "Sometimes Proper", a p of .00; if all rated it D, "Seldom Proper", a p of -.50; and if all rated it E, "Never Proper", a p of -1.00. These proportion scores are merely attempts to provide the reader with representative indexes of the responses made by each group to all of the items in the question. Also, it should be emphasized that any p between +1.00 and -1.00 could be obtained from different distributions of scores. For example, a p of .00 could be due to all C ratings, or to half B and half D ratings, or

to half A and half E ratings, or to a large number of other such combinations. The group differences reported for each item were not computed from these proportion scores, but are based on χ^2 's computed directly from the raw score frequencies made by each group on the item. As in questions one and two, the χ^2 's show the existence of distributional differences which are termed directional or non-directional. Finally, it should be noted that there did not appear to be any distributions of ratings which were bi-modal except between adjacent rating categories, hence none of the proportion scores appear to be grossly misleading.

A word of caution appears in order because of the use of positive and negative proportion scores. The reader might get the impression that negative p's indicate group disapproval of the propriety of the activity in question on a given item. This is not necessarily so. The results of this study actually are not sufficient to determine this problem one way or another. A close look at the wording of category D, for instance, shows that it does not necessarily indicate the rater considered the activity improper. If one wanted to justify more fully the use of positive and negative proportion scores, perhaps category E should read "Very Improper", category D "Improper", and category C "Sometimes Proper, Sometimes Improper". Since finding whether attitudes were absolutely positive or negative was not the purpose in mind when the question was formulated, this terminology was not used; the writer felt that a wider distribution of ratings would be obtained on more items with the wording which was used for the question, and since it was not known what distributions would occur in either instance, this was not considered a vital issue in an exploratory study such as this.

Table 31

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION THREE

Item	Proportion Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 1 and L 4				Groups L 1 and S 1				Groups L 1 and S 4			
	L 1 (N=43)	L 4 (N=34)	S 1 (N=36)	S 4 (N=31)	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Proper	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Proper	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Proper
a	.98	.99	.99	1.00	--				--				--			
b	-.55	-.34	-.61	-.50	2.93	1	.10	L 4	--				3.28	1	.10	S 4
c	-.44	-.22	-.56*	-.40	6.43	2	.05	L 4	--				--			
d	.36	.50	.47*	.40	--				--				--			
e	.92	.96	.93	.97	--				--				--			
f	.67	.59	.67	.58	--				--				--			
g	-.56*	-.29	-.43	-.19	8.22	2	.02	L 4	--				14.22	2	.001	S 4
h	-.37	-.57	-.54	-.82	--				--				13.89	2	.001	L 1
i	1.00	.99	1.00	1.00	--				--				--			
j	.33	.43	.24	.34	--				--				--			
k	.07	.16	.01	-.05	--				--				--			
l	.81	.87	.77*	.82	--				--				--			
m	.57	.74	.80*	.74	7.59	2	.05	L 4	6.85	2	.05	S 1	7.85	2	.02	S 4
n	.11*	.13	.07	-.08	4.74	2	.10	-	--				7.60	2	.05	L 1
o	-.38	-.60	-.69	-.40	--				6.74	2	.05	L 1	--			
All	.23	.29	.21	.23	3.63	1	.10	L 4	--				10.61	4	.05	-

* For these items N is one less than shown at the top for the group in question.

Table 31 (Continued)

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION THREE

Item	Proportion Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 4 and S 1				Groups L 4 and S 4				Groups S 1 and S 4			
	L 1 (N=43)	L 4 (N=34)	S 1 (N=36)	S 4 (N=31)	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Proper	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Proper	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Proper
a	.98	.99	.99	1.00	--				--				--			
b	-.55	-.34	-.61	-.50	6.12	2	.05	L 4	--				4.93	2	.10	S 4
c	-.44	-.22	-.56*	-.40	11.24	2	.01	L 4	--				4.99	2	.10	S 4
d	.36	.50	.47*	.40	--				--				--			
e	.92	.96	.93	.97	--				--				--			
f	.67	.59	.67	.58	3.05	1	.10	S 1	--				--			
g	-.56*	-.29	-.43	-.19	--				--				4.23	1	.05	S 4
h	-.37	-.57	-.54	-.82	--				5.43	2	.10	L 4	7.76	2	.05	S 1
i	1.00	.99	1.00	1.00	--				--				--			
j	.33	.43	.24	.34	2.87	1	.10	L 4	--				--			
k	.07	.16	.01	-.05	--				--				--			
l	.81	.87	.77*	.82	--				--				--			
m	.57	.74	.80*	.74	--				--				--			
n	.11*	.13	.07	-.08	--				4.64	2	.10	L 4	--			
o	-.38	-.60	-.69	-.40	--				--				6.59	2	.05	S 4
All	.23	.29	.21	.23	4.96	1	.05	L 4	3.48	1	.10	L 4	4.13	1	.05	S 4

* For these items N is one less than shown at the top for the group in question.

A discussion of the individual items now appears in order.

Item a: All the groups thought it very proper for a priest to administer the sacraments, as one might expect, hence there were no inter-group differences. One might question the inclusion of this item, and also item i, Say Mass, when this result could be so readily predicted for the groups used. There were two reasons for including these items. First, the questionnaire might be used with other subject groups whose knowledge about the priesthood might not be very accurate according to Catholic teaching, such as non-Catholics. These items would help provide a rough index of the group's knowledge about the priest's role as visualized by the Catholic Church and most of its practicing members. Moreover, one might wish to use these items as checks on the alertness of Catholic groups studied; a very high number of ratings other than "Very Proper" would be cause to question the validity of results obtained on the question (or questionnaire) as a whole. Second, it was thought that providing the subjects with one or two items where (for most of them, at least) the rating was clearly at one extreme of the scale would give them a helpful psychological reference point from which to proceed in answering the other more arbitrary items with maximum speed and clarity.

Item b: All the groups tended to see betting money at a race track as seldom proper, though the freshmen groups saw it as less proper than did the senior groups. Thus the I4 group saw it as significantly more proper than did the S1 group, and all other comparisons between first and fourth year groups showed the latter seeing this activity as more proper to a near significant degree.

Item c: All the groups tended to see drinking beer or liquor in public

as seldom to sometimes proper. The L4 group saw it as significantly more proper than did both freshman groups, however, and the S4 group saw it as more proper than did the S1 group to a near significant degree.

Item d: All groups tended to rate golfing in public as proper, and there were no inter-group differences.

Item e: All groups saw helping husbands and wives solve marital problems as very proper to an almost unanimous degree.

Item f: All the groups saw leading a fund raising drive for charity as proper or above. There were no significant inter-group differences, though the S1 group saw it as more proper than did the L4 group to a near significant degree.

Item g: The groups saw playing cards for money as seldom to sometimes proper. The S4 group saw it as significantly more proper than did both freshman groups, and the L4 group as significantly more proper than did the L1 group. Apparently the older subjects did not see this as being so objectionable as did the younger subjects, especially the younger subjects who don't intend to become priests themselves.

Item h: Just the opposite tended to be the case for participating in group dancing. The S4 group saw this as never to seldom proper; and thus saw it as less proper than did all the other groups, this being significant with both freshmen groups and near significance with the L4 group.

Item i: All the subjects in every group rated Saying Mass as very proper with the exception of one person in the L4 group who rated it proper.

Item j: All the groups rated smoking in public as proper to sometimes proper. The only inter-group difference was that the L4 group saw this as

more proper than did the S1 group to a near significant degree.

Item k: All groups saw swimming at a public beach as sometimes proper with no inter-group differences.

Item l: All groups saw teaching in school as very proper to proper with no inter-group differences.

Item m: The L1 group saw trying to help solve quarrels between children and parents as proper and so rated it as significantly less proper than did all the other groups, who rated it proper to very proper. It is interesting that the groups rated this item much less proper than item e (helping solve marital problems), and that this was most marked in the L1 group. One might wonder if this represents a tendency to feel that it is good for priests to help other people solve problems, but perhaps not so good for them to help me solve my problems with others. It would be interesting to see how adults would answer these two items.

Item n: All groups tended to see wearing non-clerical clothes in public as sometimes proper, though the S4 group saw it as less proper than did the L1 group to a significant degree and than the L4 group to a near significant degree.

Item o: All groups tended to see working to promote the campaign of a political candidate as seldom proper. This was most marked for the S1 group which saw such an activity as significantly less proper than did both the L1 and S4 groups.

Since the ratings of each item can be considered independent of one another, the results for all the items of question three can be combined for each group of subjects to see if any overall trends of group differences exist

for the question as a whole. In doing this only two significant directional group differences were found showing that the S1 group saw more of the activities itemized on question three as less proper than did both senior groups. In both instances, and especially between the S1 and S4 groups, this was due primarily to the fact that the S1 group had a proportionately high number of E ("Never Proper") ratings. There was also a non-directional significant difference between the L1 and S4 groups because the latter had proportionately more A and D ratings. These findings suggest only weak overall trends of group differences on the question of how proper it is for a priest to engage in various activities. They show that there is a tendency for significantly more members of the S1 group to see the activities named in question three as "never proper" than is the case for members of the S4 group. This is also true between the S1 and L4 groups in both the "never proper" and "seldom proper" categories combined.

In addition to looking at the results for all the items combined for overall trends, one can attempt to examine subgroups of items if they are grouped according to some meaningful criterion. An examination of the results to question three showed that one might divide the items into three groups corresponding to those seen as (a) proper to very proper, (b) sometimes proper to proper, and (c) less than sometimes proper. The easiest basis for making such a division of the items is the groups' proportion scores. Thus items with all p scores above .50 were placed in category (a), those with most or all p scores between .00 through .49 were placed in category (b), and items with all minus p scores were placed in category (c). An examination of table 31 shows that items a, e, f, i, l and m were seen as highly proper or in category (a) above;

items d, j, k and n were seen as moderately proper or in category (b) above; and items b, c, g, h and o were seen as not very proper or in category (c) above.

The most striking fact about examining these subgroups of items is that the lowest (c) shows two-thirds of all the significant inter-group differences and over two-thirds of all the near significant inter-group differences. All of the items in the lowest category showed one or more significant inter-group differences, whereas only one item each in the other two categories showed any significant inter-group differences. This suggests that the activities seen as relatively improper by the groups were the ones on which they were less likely to agree as to the degree of propriety—in short, these kind of activities appear more likely to be controversial among the four groups studied.

Table 32 gives the combined proportion scores for each of these three groups of items, "high" (items a, e, f, i, l and m), "middle" (items d, j, k and n) and "low" (items b, c, g, h and o). And table 33 gives the significant or near significant Chi^2 differences for the "middle" and "low" item groups. There was very little tendency on the part of the groups studied to disagree about the degree of propriety of behavior by the priest which they generally tended to see as proper or very proper. Only one of the items in this group showed any significant inter-group differences, namely, the Ll group saw item m, "try to help solve quarrels between children and parents", as significantly less proper than did all the other groups. There were no significant Chi^2 differences for this group of items as a whole, and eliminating item m from the high group would reduce the differences in p scores between the Ll and other groups to virtually nothing.

Table 32

PROPORTION SCORES OF GROUPS ON COMBINATIONS OF ITEMS IN QUESTION THREE

Group	Proportion Scores		
	"High" Items (a,e,f,i,l,m)	"Middle" Items (d,j,k,n)	"Low" Items (b,c,g,h,o)
L 1	.82	.22	-.46
L 4	.85	.31	-.41
S 1	.86	.20	-.57
S 4	.85	.15	-.46

Table 33

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON COMBINATIONS OF ITEMS IN QUESTION THREE

Groups Compared	"Middle" Items (d,j,k,n)				"Low" Items (b,c,g,h,o)			
	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Proper	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Proper
L 1 and L 4	5.69	3	.10	L 4	--			
L 1 and S 1	--				7.89	3	.05	L 1
L 1 and S 4	--				--			
L 4 and S 1	7.07	3	.10	L 4	11.58	3	.01	L 4
L 4 and S 4	13.18	3	.01	L 4	--			
S 1 and S 4	--				6.60	2	.05	S 4

On the "middle" items, i.e. those seen as sometimes proper to proper, there is some disagreement between groups. Thus there appears to be a tendency for non-seminarians and seminarians to go from a position of virtual agreement on such items to positions of disagreement as they advance from their first to fourth years of secondary schooling. The only significant difference for this combination of items was that the L₄ group tended to see these activities as more proper for a priest than did the S₄ group. There were near significant differences between the L₄ and both freshmen groups in the same direction with three df but comparisons at two and one df showed differences which weren't even near significance.

On the "low" items was where the most inter-group divergence of opinion appeared to occur. When the combination of these items is taken as a whole, the results show that the S₁ group tended to rate these seldom to sometimes proper activities as significantly less proper than did all three other groups. There were no other inter-group differences. The pattern of individual item differences shows that all the significant or near significant differences between the S₁ and other groups were in this same direction with only one exception, when the S₄ group saw participating in group dancing as significantly less proper than did the S₁ group.

All of these results suggest that there may be tendencies for groups to differ in certain general directions concerning their opinions about how proper various activities are for priests, but that exceptions may exist to such general trends depending upon the specific activity in question.

Question Four

Table 34 gives the proportion scores and inter-group differences for each

item and for all the items combined in question four. The derivation of p scores was the same as for question three and the discussion about the meaning of the p scores for question three applies in its entirety to the p scores for question four. The significant and near significant differences given for each item are based on χ^2 tests made from the raw score frequencies made by each group on the items. A discussion of each individual item now appears in order.

Item a: Trouble accepting some teaching of the Church: The S4 group expected the average priest to understand this problem very well; all three other groups expected significantly less understanding than did the S4 group, but still expected the average priest's understanding to be well or above.

Item b: Difficulty doing well in school or academic work: The groups expected the average priest to understand this problem well or slightly below. Again the S4 group expected the greatest degree of understanding, but this was not statistically noteworthy except over the I4 group to a near significant degree.

Item c: Disagreement or conflict with one's parents: The seminarians expected the priest to understand this problem better (well or above) than did the non-seminarians (slightly below well). This difference was statistically significant only between the S1 group and both lay groups, however, it only tended toward significance between the S4 and I4 groups, and didn't even approach significance between the S4 and I1 group.

Item d: Habit of losing one's temper and doing wrong things out of anger: The I1 group saw the priest as significantly less understanding of this problem than did all three other groups. The I1 group expected the priest to understand well to only fairly well, the I4 group slightly less than well, and

Table 34

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION FOUR

Item	<u>Proportion Scores</u>				<u>Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:</u>											
	<u>In Group:</u>				<u>Groups L 1 and L 4</u>				<u>Groups L 1 and S 1</u>				<u>Groups L 1 and S 4</u>			
	L 1	L 4	S 1	S 4	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Under- standing	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Under- standing	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Under- standing
	(N=42)	(N=34)	(N=36)	(N=31)												
a	.54	.53	.67	.84	--				--				9.33	2	.01	S 4
b	.38	.32	.43	.52	--				--				--			
c	.48	.40	.68	.61	--				6.66	2	.05	S 1	--			
d	.30	.44	.54	.56	4.26	1	.05	L 4	9.62	2	.01	S 1	8.39	2	.02	S 4
e	-.07	-.09	.07	.18	--				--				6.84	2	.05	S 4
f	.37	.25	.43	.45	--				--				--			
g	.65	.63	.67	.81	--				--				--			
h	.45	.38	.39	.52	--				--				--			
i	.33	.35	.22	.52	--				--				--			
j	.18	.16	.08	.42	--				9.05	3	.05	-	4.34	1	.05	S 4
k	.19	.40	.22	.63	2.95	1	.10	L 4	--				12.52	3	.01	S 4
l	.29	.08*	.14	.23	4.73	2	.10	L 1	6.25	3	.10	-	--			
m	.20	.00	.14	.23	--				--				--			
n	.19	.38	.38	.67	--				3.94	1	.05	S 1	15.14	2	.001	S 4
o	.64	.68	.58	.74	--				--				--			
All	.34	.33	.38	.53	9.32	4	.10	-	5.71	1	.02	S 1	43.73	4	.001	S 4

* On this item N=33.

Table 34 (Continued)

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION FOUR

Item	<u>Proportion Scores</u>				<u>Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:</u>											
	<u>In Group:</u>				<u>Groups L 4 and S 1</u>				<u>Groups L 4 and S 4</u>				<u>Groups S 1 and S 4</u>			
	L 1 (N=42)	L 4 (N=34)	S 1 (N=36)	S 4 (N=31)	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Under- standing	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Under- standing	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Under- standing
a	.54	.53	.67	.84	5.25	2	.10	-	8.44	2	.02	S 4	4.99	1	.05	S 4
b	.38	.32	.43	.52	--				2.85	1	.10	S 4	--			
c	.48	.40	.68	.61	9.86	2	.01	S 1	4.73	2	.10	S 4	--			
d	.30	.44	.54	.56	--				--				--			
e	-.07	-.09	.07	.18	--				7.15	2	.05	S 4	--			
f	.37	.25	.43	.45	--				--				--			
g	.65	.63	.67	.81	--				--				--			
h	.45	.38	.39	.52	--				--				--			
i	.33	.35	.22	.52	--				--				3.98	1	.05	S 4
j	.18	.16	.08	.42	--				--				9.62	2	.01	S 4
k	.19	.40	.22	.63	--				--				8.67	2	.02	S 4
l	.29	.08*	.14	.23	--				--				--			
m	.20	.00	.14	.23	--				--				--			
n	.19	.38	.38	.67	--				3.20	1	.10	S 4	4.62	2	.10	S 4
o	.64	.68	.58	.74	--				--				--			
All	.34	.33	.38	.53	--				42.41	4	.001	S 4	28.16	4	.001	S 4

* On this item N=33.

the seminarian groups slightly better than well.

Item e: Difficulty with money-financial problems: The S4 group expected the priest to understand this problem fairly well to well; hence the S4 group saw the priest as significantly more understanding than did both non-seminarian groups, who expected the priest to understand less than fairly well. The S1 group was in between, and thus did not differ significantly from any of the other groups.

Item f: Trouble getting to Mass on Sundays: All the groups expected the priest to understand this problem well to slightly well; there were no significant inter-group differences.

Item g: Improper sex desires: The S4 group expected the priest to understand this problem very well to well, and the other three groups well to very well; there were no significant inter-group differences, however.

Item h: Trouble living up to the fasting regulations of the Church: The groups expected the average priest to understand this problem well or below; there were no significant inter-group differences.

Item i: Constantly using vulgar or indecent language: The S4 group expected the average priest to understand this problem well, hence saw the priest as significantly more understanding than did the S1 group (fairly well to well). The non-seminarian groups were in between and no other significant inter-group differences occurred.

Item j: Anger toward a priest for something he said or did: The S4 group expected the average priest to understand this problem slightly less than well whereas for the other groups it was fairly well to well. Hence the S4 group saw the priest as significantly more understanding than did both freshmen

groups; but there was no other significant difference, even between the S₄ and I₄ groups.

Item k: Hardships parents have in raising their children: The senior groups tended to expect the average priest to understand this problem better than did the freshmen groups. The S₄ group saw the priest as understanding well to very well, hence rated the priest significantly higher than both freshmen groups, who saw the priest as understanding fairly well to well. The I₄ group saw the average priest as understanding well to fairly well, but rated the priest as higher in understanding than just the I₁ group, and only to a near significant degree.

Item l: Habit of coming late to Sunday Mass: The groups expected the average priest to understand this problem fairly well to well. There was one near significant difference showing that the I₁ group saw the priest as more understanding than did the I₄ group, and one showing a non-directional difference trend between the I₁ and S₁ groups.

Item m: Failure to give enough money to the Church: The groups expected the average priest to understand this problem only fairly well to well with no inter-group differences.

Item n: Inability to get along with one's spouse: The S₄ group expected the average priest to understand this problem well to very well, the S₁ and I₄ groups only well to fairly well, and the I₁ group only fairly well to well. Hence the S₄ group saw the priest as more understanding than did the I₁ group to a very significant degree, and than both the S₁ and I₄ groups to a near significant degree. And the S₁ group saw the priest as significantly more understanding than did the I₁ group for the only other inter-group difference.

Item 0: Being afraid about going to confession: The groups expected the average priest to understand this problem well to very well with no inter-group differences occurring.

Since the ratings to all the items given by each group can be considered independent of one another, it is possible to combine the results for all of the items together to determine if any overall trends and differences exist. Table 34 shows the average proportion scores at the bottom and any instance where a significant or near significant χ^2 occurred between two groups for the question as a whole. The most apparent trend is for the S4 group to see the priest as more understanding than did all three other groups. The χ^2 tests show very significant directional differences between the S4 and every other group; and only in two instances did the S4 group make a p score lower than that given by another group on any item, once with each of the freshman groups on different items. These overall differences are clearly reflected in the mean proportion scores for all of the groups, moreover.

There was only one other directional difference for question four as a whole—one which is not so clearly reflected in the proportion scores. This shows that the S1 group tended to see the average priest as more understanding than did the I1 group. Finally, there was one non-directional difference between the I1 and I4 groups which only approached significance. This shows a tendency for the I4 group to select categories A and C ("Very Well" and "Fairly Well") proportionately less; and categories B, D and E ("Well", "Poorly" and "Very Poorly") proportionately more than did the I1 group. This difference occurred primarily in categories B, C and E.

In summary, the overall results show that the S4 group saw the average

priest as significantly more understanding than did all the other groups; the S1 group came next and saw the average priest as significantly more understanding than did the L1 or its non-seminarian peer group. This finding is easy to understand as a function of the vocation being sought by the seminarian groups, who apparently are motivated to see the priest in a more favorable light and who can identify more readily with the priest as a human person whose experiences are not so different from those of lay people that they make him less able to understand their problems. It is worth noting that a few seminarians, when asked what they thought of this question, commented that just because a man is a priest doesn't mean he can't understand the problems of others as well as anyone else. They apparently reacted to the possible implication which one might draw from question four that perhaps priests don't understand the problems of the laity very well. Of course these results have no clear bearing on whether this is so or not. It is worth noting, however, that the non-seminarian groups tended to see the priest's degree of understanding for all the problems listed as well to fairly well. It would be interesting to see how well they would expect other kinds of people in their environment—such as mothers, fathers, teachers, etc.—to understand such problems in order to compare this with their opinions about the priest's understanding.

Question Five

This question differed from the others in that the different categories to which each item could be assigned were discrete entities rather than successive points along an ordinal scale. Hence the proportion scores on question five have a somewhat different basis, namely, they show the proportion of subjects in each group who thought the priest was the individual best able to help for

the problem cited in each item. For the purpose of computing the proportion scores, therefore, the categories "X" (counseling psychologist) and "Z" (psychiatrist) were not differentiated. And these same two categories were the only ones that could be combined on a "directional" basis in computing χ^2 's from the raw score frequencies at one degree of freedom.

Table 35 gives these proportion scores for all of the items on question five. It also gives the significant or near-significant inter-group χ^2 's that showed when one of the groups considered the priest "best able to help" (with the problem cited) more frequently than did another group. For χ^2 's done with two df, a significant χ^2 was not reported unless one group had a higher observed frequency (F_o) than expected frequency (F_e) for category "Y" (priest), and vice versa for both of the other two categories. Thus, if the F_o was higher than the F_e for category "Y" and either of the other two categories, it could not be considered clear that this group saw the priest as best able to help to a greater degree; such significant χ^2 's are much the same as the non-directional differences found on the other questions, at least insofar as the purposes of this study are concerned. With the above distinctions in mind, we can now proceed to a discussion of the results obtained for each item.

Item a: A young person wants to decide what occupation to choose: The priest was chosen 6 to 29% of the time by the four groups with the only significant difference being that the L1 group selected the priest more often than did the S4 group. Most of the subjects in all the groups selected counseling psychologist as best able to help.

Item b: A person has financial or money problems: The priest was chosen 14 to 23% of the time by the groups with no significant inter-group differences.

Table 35

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION FIVE

Item	Proportion Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 1 and L 4				Groups L 1 and S 1				Groups L 1 and S 4			
	L 1 (N=43)	L 4 (N=34)	S 1 (N=36)	S 4 (N=31)	Chi ²	df	P	Priest Seen As Best Able To Help	Chi ²	df	P	Priest Seen As Best Able To Help	Chi ²	df	P	Priest Seen As Best Able To Help
a	.29*	.24	.20*	.06	--				--				4.19	1	.05	L 1
b	.14*	.18*	.20*	.23	--				--				--			
c	.91	.82	.94*	.97	--				--				--			
d	.02	.00	.00	.00	--				--				--			
e	.46**	.12	.47	.32	8.81	1	.01	L 1	--				--			
f	1.00	.94*	.89*	.97*	--						.08 ^f	L 1	--			
g	.26*	.12	.17*	.19	--				--				--			
h	.84	.61*	.85**	.58	3.99	1	.05	L 1	--				4.03	1	.05	L 1
i	.21*	.15	.40*	.20*	--				--				--			
j	.53	.50	.74*	.77	--				2.72	1	.10	S 1	3.45	1	.10	S 4
k	.84	.61*	.89	.87	3.99	1	.05	L 1	--				--			
l	.00	.00	.00	.00	--				--				--			
m	.69*	.21	.53	.77	15.79	1	.001	L 1	--				--			
n	1.00	.97	1.00	1.00	--				--				--			
o	.86	.94	.94	.97	--				--				--			
p	.95	.94	1.00	.97*	--				--				--			
All	.57	.46	.58	.55	15.76	2	.001	L 1	--				--			

* N is one less than shown for the group.

** N is two less than shown for the group.

f Probability found using Fisher's exact probability test.

Table 35 (Continued)

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION FIVE

Item	<u>Proportion Scores</u>				<u>Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:</u>											
	<u>In Group:</u>				<u>Groups L 4 and S 1</u>				<u>Groups L 4 and S 4</u>				<u>Groups S 1 and S 4</u>			
	L 1	L 4	S 1	S 4	Chi ²	df	P	Priest Seen As Best Able To Help	Chi ²	df	P	Priest Seen As Best Able To Help	Chi ²	df	P	Priest Seen As Best Able To Help
	(N=43)	(N=34)	(N=36)	(N=31)												
a	.29*	.24	.20*	.06	--				--				--			
b	.14*	.18*	.20*	.23	--				--				--			
c	.91	.82	.94*	.97	--				--				--			
d	.02	.00	.00	.00	--				--				--			
e	.46**	.12	.47	.32	8.83	1	.01	S 1	2.85	1	.10	S 4	--			
f	1.00	.94*	.89*	.97*	--				--				--			
g	.26*	.12	.17*	.19	--				--				--			
h	.84	.61*	.85**	.58*	3.94	1	.05	S 1	--				3.94	1	.05	S 1
i	.21*	.15	.40*	.20*	4.42	1	.05	S 1	--				--			
j	.53	.50	.74*	.77	3.39	1	.10	S 1	4.03	1	.05	S 4	--			
k	.84	.61*	.89	.87	6.06	1	.02	S 1	4.40	1	.05	S 4	--			
l	.00	.00	.00	.00	--				--				--			
m	.69*	.21	.53	.77	6.37	1	.02	S 1	18.70	1	.001	S 4	3.38	1	.10	S 4
n	1.00	.97	1.00	1.00	--				--				--			
o	.86	.94	.94	.97	--				--				--			
p	.95	.94	1.00	.97*	--				--				--			
All	.57	.46	.58	.55	15.87	2	.001	S 1	10.15	2	.01	S 4	--			

153

* N is one less than shown for the group.

** N is two less than shown for the group.

Again counseling psychologist was selected by most of the subjects in all groups.

Item c: A husband and wife constantly disagree, argue and fight with each other: The priest was seen as best able to help 82 to 97% of the time with no significant inter-group differences.

Item d: A person constantly sees or hears things that don't really exist: The priest was chosen by only one subject in all of the groups; most of the subjects selected the psychiatrist as best able to help.

Item e: A student is having trouble getting his schoolwork well enough: Only 12% of the L4 group selected the priest as best able to help with this problem; both freshmen groups (46 and 47%) saw the priest as better able to help to a significant degree (i.e. as best able to help significantly more often), and the S4 group (32%) to a near significant degree. Of the other two categories, counseling psychologist was selected more often.

Item f: A person wants to talk something over in private without having to worry that it will become known by outsiders: The priest was chosen by far the most often (by 39 to 100% of the groups) and there were no significant inter-group differences.

Item g: A parent wants to get his child over a great fear of going to school: Only around one-fifth (12 to 26%) of the groups selected the priest as best able to help; there were no significant inter-group differences concerning how often the priest was selected as opposed to the other two professions taken together, and neither was there any clear-cut unanimity about which of the other two professions would be best to consult.

Item h: A husband and wife cannot get along sexually with each other:

The priest was selected by both freshman groups (34 and 85%) significantly more often than by both senior groups (61 and 58%).

Item i: A person believes he is God or the Messiah: Most of the subjects selected the psychiatrist as best able to help. The S1 group selected the priest more than the other groups (40% as opposed to 15, 20 and 21%), but the only significant difference was between the S1 and I4 groups.

Item j: A person has great difficulty controlling his temper: About half of the high school subjects (53 and 50%) selected the priest as best able to help, but around three-fourths of the seminarians (74 and 77%) did so. This resulted in near significant differences between the I1 and both seminarian groups and between the I4 and S1 groups, while only the difference between both senior groups reached significance.

Item k: A person has sexual wants which he does not want or cannot control: The I4 group selected the priest significantly less often (61%) than did all the other groups (84 to 89%). It is noteworthy that all the groups selected the priest more than the non-priests.

Item l: A person wants to get over an abnormal fear of certain things: None of the subjects selected the priest; most chose the psychiatrist as best able to help.

Item m: Parents are having trouble getting their children to obey them properly: Only 21% of the I4 group selected the priest, significantly less than all the other groups (53% or higher). Moreover, more in the S4 group (77%) than in the S1 group (53%) selected the priest to a near significant degree.

Item n: A person is afraid to go to confession: All but one subject in the I4 group selected the priest as best able to help with this problem.

Item o: A person wants help for something and doesn't know whom else to see: Again by far most of the subjects in all groups (86 to 97%) selected the priest as best able to help with no significant inter-group differences.

Item p: A person feels like everything he does is a sin: The results are virtually the same as for the previous item; 94 to 100% of the groups selected the priest as best able to help with this problem.

Since the ratings on each item can be made independently of one another, the groups can be compared for their responses to all of the items of question five combined. When this is done, it shows that the L4 group selects the priest as best able to help (with the listed problems) significantly less often than all three other groups. The other groups showed very little overall differences among themselves on this question as a whole. This finding suggests that as lay adolescent boys get older they tend to look less toward the priest for help with their personal problems, whereas this tendency is not present in minor seminarians. It would be interesting to see what the results would be if this question were given to major seminarians and college lay people, and to priests and lay adults.

Also noteworthy is the fact that the subjects saw the priest as best able to help with so many problems, and especially with such things as sexual difficulties (h and k) and scrupulosity (p). The priest is seen as the best able to help with family problems (c, h, and m), though much like in question three the subjects were more willing to see the priest as helpful for difficulties between parents than for difficulties between parents and children (c versus m). From this viewpoint it would also be interesting to contrast these adolescents' reactions to this question along with those which might be obtained from

psychiatrists, psychologists and clergymen.

Question Six

The use of proportion scores and the Chi^2 computations for this question are much the same as for the first four questions. They will be given in table 36.

Although five rating categories were used, an examination of the raw score distributions suggest that three were enough for any given item, though not always the same three. Thus the distribution of responses to almost half the items (especially s, f, l, m and n; also c and h) would not have been changed very markedly by the elimination of the two extreme rating categories (A and E); and for at least half the items (b, d, e, g, i, k, o and p; again also c and h), no marked changes in rating distributions would have occurred if the last two rating categories (D and E) had been omitted. The writer's opinion is that three categories, approximating most closely the middle three used, would have provided for more clear-cut and meaningful rating distributions. If negative as well as positive activities should be included in the items, however, then five categories could be used; but it would be best to revise them so that A and B were clearly positive (satisfaction, pleasantness or the like), D and E clearly negative (dissatisfaction, unpleasantness or the like), with C being in between or neutral.

Despite the above-cited drawbacks in the rating distributions obtained, it can still be assumed that any differences found have meaning and value for the purposes of this study. And so they will be reported in the discussion which follows, referring to table 36.

Table 36

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION SIX

Item	Proportion Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 1 and L 4				Groups L 1 and S 1				Groups L 1 and S 4			
	L 1 (N=43)	L 4 (N=34)	S 1 (N=36)	S 4 (N=31)	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Satis- fying	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Satis- fying	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Satis- fying
a	.56	.57	.56	.57	--				--				--			
b	.90	.86	.88	.81	--				--				--			
c	.69*	.63	.65	.72	--				--				--			
d	.72	.62	.79	.77	--				--				--			
e	.83	.76	.81	.81	--				--				--			
f	.51*	.45	.49	.34	--				--				11.85	1	.001	L 1
g	.77	.74	.86	.92	--				--				8.48	2	.02	S 4
h	.97	.99	1.00	.97	--				--				--			
i	.77	.76	.80	.73	--				--				--			
j	.40	.32	.30	.31	--				--				--			
k	.71	.78	.76	.85	--				--				7.76	2	.05	S 4
l	.50	.49	.65	.57	--				6.25	1	.02	S 1	--			
m	.53	.47	.37	.35	2.72	1	.10	L 1	8.52	2	.02	L 1	12.09	2	.01	L 1
n	.50	.46	.60	.50	--				3.13	1	.10	S 1	--			
o	.92	.93	.93	.81	--				--				4.23	1	.05	L 1
p	.74	.74	.77	.89	--				--				9.45	2	.01	S 4
All	.69	.66	.70	.68	5.20	1	.05	L 1	9.33	4	.10	-	10.15	4	.05	-

* On these items N=42.

f Probability found using Fisher's exact probability test.

Table 36 (Continued)

PROPORTION SCORES AND SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS ON QUESTION SIX

Item	Proportion Scores				Significant and Near-Significant Differences Between:											
	In Group:				Groups L 4 and S 1				Groups L 4 and S 4				Groups S 1 and S 4			
	L 1 (N=43)	L 4 (N=34)	S 1 (N=36)	S 4 (N=31)	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Satis- fying	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Satis- fying	Chi ²	df	P	Saw As MORE Satis- fying
a	.56	.57	.56	.57	--				--				--			
b	.90	.86	.88	.81	--				--		.02 ^f	L 4	--		.01 ^f	S 1
c	.69*	.63	.65	.72	--				--				--			
d	.72	.62	.79	.77	10.31	2	.01	S 1	6.29	2	.05	S 4	--			
e	.83	.76	.81	.81	--				--				--			
f	.51*	.45	.49	.34	--				--				4.93	2	.10	S 1
g	.77	.74	.86	.92	4.67	2	.10	S 1	10.52	2	.01	S 4	--			
h	.97	.99	1.00	.97	--				--				--			
i	.77	.76	.80	.73	--				--				--			
j	.40	.32	.30	.31	--				--				--			
k	.71	.78	.76	.85	--				5.61	2	.10	S 4	--			
l	.50	.49	.65	.57	3.93	1	.05	S 1	--				--			
m	.53	.47	.37	.35	6.51	2	.05	L 4	--		.01 ^f	L 4	--			
n	.50	.46	.60	.50	3.13	1	.10	S 1	--				--			
o	.92	.93	.93	.81	--				3.38	1	.10	L 4	3.90	1	.05	S 1
p	.74	.74	.77	.80	--				15.17	1	.001	S 4	5.13	1	.05	S 4
All	.69	.66	.70	.68	15.74	3	.01	S 1	12.58	1	.001	S 4	--			

* On these items N=42.

f Probability found using Fisher's exact probability test.

Item a: Giving Sermons: All the groups saw the average priest as getting some satisfaction from this activity with no noteworthy inter-group differences.

Item b: Baptizing children: The groups tended to see the priest as getting very much to much satisfaction. The Sh group saw the priest as getting significantly less satisfaction than did every other group; this was because the Sh group had a few C ratings whereas all the others had only one or two below category B. The groups did not differ significantly in the ratio of their A as opposed to their B ratings, it should be noted.

Item c: Teaching school: The priest was seen by all groups as getting much to some satisfaction from this activity with no significant inter-group differences.

Item d: Visiting the sick: The Ll group saw the priest as getting some to much satisfaction, whereas all the other groups saw the priest as getting much satisfaction from this activity. Hence the Ll group rated it significantly less satisfying than did both seminarian groups, though there was no other significant inter-group difference.

Item e: Giving instructions to convert and inquiry classes: All the groups saw the priest as getting slightly more than much satisfaction from this activity with no significant inter-group differences.

Item f: Raising money for the Church: The Sh group saw this activity as giving little to some satisfaction, whereas the other three groups saw it as giving some satisfaction. Hence the Sh group saw it as less satisfying than did both freshmen groups; this was significant with the Ll group and nearly significant with the Sl group. No other significant inter-group difference was found.

Item g: Visiting the Dying: The Ll and Ll groups rated this activity as giving much satisfaction, whereas the Sl group rated it as giving much to very much satisfaction and the Sh group very much satisfaction. Hence the Sh group rated it as significantly more satisfying than did the Ll and Ll groups, and the Sl group rated it more satisfying than did the Ll group to a near significant degree.

Item h: Saying Mass: All the groups were virtually unanimous in seeing this activity as giving the average priest very much satisfaction.

Item i: Presiding at weddings: All the groups tended to rate this activity as giving much satisfaction to the average priest; there were no significant inter-group differences.

Item j: Running the Parish business affairs: This activity was given the lowest rating by all the groups, being seen as giving little to some satisfaction with no significant inter-group differences.

Item k: Hearing confessions: The Sh group rated this the highest, much to very much satisfaction, whereas the other groups rated it around the level of much satisfaction. Hence the Sh group rated it higher than the Ll group to a significant degree, and than the Ll group to a near significant degree.

Item l: Saying his office or breviary prayers: The Ll and Ll groups rated this activity as giving much satisfaction whereas both seminarian groups rated it higher, the Sl group rating it as significantly more satisfying than did both lay groups.

Item m: Handling Parish social events: The seminarians rated this item as giving little to some satisfaction, whereas both lay groups rated it around the level of some satisfaction. Hence both lay groups rated this as

significantly more satisfying than did both seminarian groups. And the L1 group rated it more satisfying than did the L4 group to a near significant degree.

Item n: Presiding at funerals: The S1 group rated this the highest, some to much satisfaction, while the other three groups rated it at the level of some satisfaction or below. The S1 group's ratings were higher than the L4 group's to a significant degree, and than the L1 group's to a near significant degree.

Item o: Giving Communion: The S4 group rated this much to very much satisfaction, whereas the other groups rated it higher. This involved significant differences between the S4 group and both freshmen groups, and a near significant difference between the S4 and L4 groups.

Item p: Counseling parishioners: The S4 group saw this activity as giving very much satisfaction and hence rated it significantly higher than did all the other groups, which rated it as giving much satisfaction.

Since all of the ratings given to the items of question six can be made independently of one another, they can be combined and the subject groups compared with respect to their responses on the question on a whole. When this was done the only significant directional differences showed the L4 group rating the activities in question as significantly less satisfying for the priest than did all the other subject groups. It should be noted that the main basis for the L4 group's differences from both the L1 and S4 groups was the fact that the L4 group had so many fewer A ratings; thus compared to the S4 group, the L4 group had proportionately fewer ratings in categories A, C and E; and compared to the L1 group, proportionately fewer in categories A and C, with the groups

being just about equal in category E.

The only other differences between groups on question six as a whole were distributional, reflecting further the patterns noted above involving the II_4 group. Thus the II_4 and SI_4 groups differed significantly because the SI_4 group had proportionately more A, D and E ratings. And the II_4 and SI_4 groups differed to a near significant degree because the SI_4 group had proportionately more A and D ratings, the II_4 group more C ratings, with both groups being nearly equal in their B and E ratings.

In this and all the questions, there has been an emphasis on inter-group differences, yet it should be apparent to the reader that considerable similarity in group opinions has appeared in addition to the many inter-group differences shown. For example, it might be of interest to know how similar the groups were with respect to the order of their ratings of the activities listed in question six. This was assessed by ranking the items on the basis of each subject group's proportion scores, and then computing a rank correlation between each subject group's rankings. For question six the correlations ranged from .83 to .93, all significant at the one per cent level of confidence. The SI_4 group's rankings correlated lowest, showing r 's of .83 (with the II_4 group) and .86 twice. Among the other three groups were correlations of .91 (between the II_4 and SI_4 groups), and .93 twice. These findings appear related to the fact that the SI_4 group was involved in 15 of the 20 significant inter-group differences obtained on question six, whereas each of the other groups was involved in only eight or nine of such differences. The SI_4 group thus tends to have more specific differences of opinion with the other groups on question six, though not in a constant direction. And this finding seems to further

support the statement made in connection with earlier questions that the Sh group has stronger and clearer opinions about the priesthood than do any of the other groups.

This completes the detailed reporting of the results. In the next chapter a global summary of the results will be attempted, followed by a consideration of how they bear on the hypotheses of this study as well as on any related work done by the studies reviewed in chapter two.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE HYPOTHESES AND TO PREVIOUS STUDIES

The questionnaire which was constructed and administered to four groups of subjects in secondary Catholic schools—high school freshmen (I₁ group) and seniors (I₄ group), and minor seminarians in their first (S₁ group) and fourth (S₄ group) years of study—attempted to obtain information about their opinions in six areas: (1) How similar is the priesthood to fourteen other professions or occupations? (2) How desirable is it for the priest to possess each of seventeen virtues or qualities? (3) How proper is it for a priest to engage in each of fifteen different kinds of activities? (4) How well would they expect a priest to understand each of fifteen different problems which a lay Catholic might have? (5) When lay persons have problems for which they are seeking outside help, for which of fifteen kinds of problems would the priest be best able to help as opposed to the psychiatrist or counseling psychologist? And (6) how much satisfaction would the subjects expect the average priest to get from each of sixteen different activities which might be a part of his duties?

Evidence For Similarity In the Groups' Opinions

Though the main focus of analyzing the results has been the finding of any differences which exist in the opinions of the four subject groups, one major impression about their responses to the questions is that a great deal of similarity exists in their opinions about the six areas investigated. This should

be kept in mind throughout any consideration of the inter-group differences found, namely, that we are considering differences among groups which are greatly alike in their general opinions about the subject-matter under investigation, the Catholic priesthood.

Thus the rank correlations done between the ranks of the groups' proportion scores on questions one, two and six are all very high, never lower than .72 and all significant at the one per cent level of confidence. Excluding the ranking questions (1R and 2R) from consideration, it should be noted that 391 (70%) of the total number of 558 inter-group comparisons made on the six rating questions showed no differences (directional or non-directional) even approaching significance. And of the 167 differences found, only 111 (20% of the total) were significant while the other 56 (10% of the total) only approached significance. The existence of definite and meaningful differences among the groups need not be discounted in pointing out that this evidence strongly suggests great similarity in the groups' overall opinions about the aspects of the priesthood investigated here.

Summary By Questions

On the basis of the rating results alone (excluding questions 1R and 2R), question one showed the highest proportion of inter-group differences out of the total number of inter-group comparisons, 21 which were significant and 10 which were nearly significant (25% and 12%) out of a total of 84. Question one was followed in order by question two with 20 significant and 14 near significant differences (20% and 14%) out of 102 comparisons, question four with 18 significant and eight near significant differences (20% and 9%) out of 90 comparisons, question three with 17 significant and 11 near significant

differences (19% and 12%) out of 90 comparisons, question six with 16 significant and seven near significant differences (17% and 7%) out of 96 comparisons, and question five with 16 significant and six near significant differences (17% and 6%) out of 96 inter-group comparisons.

The results from question one show a general tendency for the lay groups to see greater similarity between the priesthood and the other occupations listed, with this tendency being more marked for the older groups so that the S₄ group definitely saw the least general similarity and the L₄ group tended to see the most. Summarizing the significant and near significant differences together, the following directional inter-group differences occurred: The L₄ group rated doctor, lawyer and salesman as more similar than did the L₁ group, with the latter rating only architect as more similar than did the L₄ group. The L₁ group rated judge, scientist and business man as more similar than did the S₁ group. And the L₁ group rated counselor, scientist, soldier and architect as more similar than did the S₄ group. The L₄ group rated business man, judge, manager and salesman as more similar than did the S₁ group, which in turn rated only the architect as more similar than did the L₄ group. The L₄ group rated lawyer, salesman, soldier, foreman and scientist as more similar than did the S₄ group. And finally, the S₁ group rated architect, soldier and engineer as more similar than did the S₄ group, and the latter rated business man as more similar than did the S₁ group. Counselor, professor and teacher were the only occupations listed which showed no inter-group differences, these being three out of the four rated highest by the four groups.

The results from question 1R show that the ranking and rating approaches to the question yielded a greatly different pattern of inter-group differences

on specific items, which could not be predicted from one approach to the other. At the same time, it was demonstrated that the rating and ranking approaches can yield virtually the same information about the relative order of similarity seen between the occupations listed and the priesthood. For each subject group the fourteen occupations were ranked first according to the order of their proportion scores and then according to the order of their mean rank scores; when these two sets of ranks for each subject group were correlated by the rank difference method very high rho's were obtained (.96 or above) which were all significant at the one per cent level of confidence. This shows that the two methods are equivalent as far as derivation of relative ranks is concerned, though it doesn't demonstrate for certain that the same results would be obtained from each method if they were used independently of one another. For all of the groups taken together, the relative similarity of the occupations to the priesthood is roughly in the following order from highest to lowest: counselor, teacher, doctor and professor; then soldier, manager and judge with very little difference among themselves; then salesman, business man and lawyer with very little difference among themselves; then foreman, architect, scientist and engineer. These composite rankings are based primarily on the ranks of the rating scores made by the groups.

The results from question two show that the S4 group tended to rate the good qualities listed as more desirable for a priest to have than did all of the other groups. The same was true to a lesser degree of the S1 group when it was compared to the I1 group. Thus the seminarians showed greater conviction than their non-seminarian peers about the desirability of good qualities in priests—especially such qualities as cheerfulness, humility, patience with

others, and zeal. Also there was a mild tendency for this conviction to increase with age in both the seminarian and lay groups—most notably with respect to the qualities of intelligence, persuasiveness and politeness. A summary of the directional significant and near significant inter-group rating differences is as follows: The I₄ group saw persuasiveness, intelligence, politeness and sincerity as more desirable than did the I₁ group. The S₁ group saw humility, patience with others and zeal as more desirable than did the I₁ group. The S₄ group saw cheerfulness, humility, patience with others, persuasiveness, politeness, sense of humor, tolerance and understanding as more desirable than did the I₁ group. The S₁ group rated humility, zeal and cheerfulness as more desirable than did the I₄ group; which in turn rated persuasiveness, sincerity and intelligence as more desirable than did the S₁ group. The S₄ group rated ability to give up comfort, cheerfulness, sense of humor, humility and patience with others as more desirable than did the I₄ group. And finally, the S₄ group rated ability to give up comfort, sense of humor, tolerance, intelligence, persuasiveness, politeness and will power as more desirable than did the S₁ group. Courage, Hope in God, perseverance and respect for people were the items on which no inter-group differences appeared.

On question 2R it was again demonstrated that the rating and ranking approaches are likely to result in different patterns of inter-group differences. The one possible exception might be when the rating differences between two groups are fairly evenly divided in opposite directions; but even in the one instance that this happened—between the S₁ and I₄ groups—the ranking results showed additional differences in each direction which could not have been predicted from the rating results. On the other hand, it was again demonstrated

that the rating and ranking approaches can yield very similar results about each group's relative order of preference for the qualities listed. When each group's proportion scores (from question two) were ranked, and then correlated with the ranks of its mean rank scores (from question 2R), the rho's obtained were all .90 or above and all significant at the .01 level of confidence. Since questions two and 2R were given in full view of each other, this does not prove for certain that the two approaches would yield similar results if given independently of one another. However, it does demonstrate that they can yield virtually the same results about relative preferences of items at the same time that they differ greatly with respect to the patterns of inter-group differences of opinion revealed about the items. For all of the groups taken together, the relative desirability for the priest to have the qualities listed is roughly in the following order from highest to lowest: Hope in God and understanding; sincerity, patience with others, zeal, perseverance, will power and courage with very little difference among themselves; then humility, cheerfulness and respect for people with very little difference among themselves; then tolerance, ability to give up comfort, intelligence and sense of humor; and finally politeness and persuasiveness with very little difference between themselves. These composite rankings are based primarily on the ranks of the rating scores made by the groups.

The results for question three showed only one clear-cut general difference, namely, that the S1 group checked the "Never Proper" category more frequently than did both senior groups. However, when the items were combined into subgroups of high ("Proper" to "Very Proper"), middle ("Sometimes Proper" to "Proper") and low (less than "Sometimes Proper") categories of propriety,

some additional inter-group difference trends were shown. Thus over two-thirds of all inter-group item differences occurred on items in the low category, all such items showing at least one inter-group difference. Only one item in the high and one in the middle categories showed any inter-group differences. The subject groups showed no differences in their responses to the high items as a unit. But on the middle items (Golf in public, Smoke in public, Swim at a public beach, and Wear non-clerical clothes in public) as a unit there was a trend for the L4 group to see the activities combined as more proper than did every other subject group. And on the lower items (Bet money at a race track, Drink beer or liquor in public, Play cards for money, Participate in group dancing, and Work to promote the campaign of a political candidate) there was a significant tendency for the S1 group to see the activities combined as less proper than did every other subject group (Participate in group dancing was a strong exception to this overall tendency between the S1 and both senior groups).

These difference tendencies on combinations of items suggest a general tendency for the older subjects to be less concerned than the younger subjects about the degree of impropriety of activities seen as less than "proper", though at least one very marked specific exception to this general statement appears to exist. Also, this age difference appears to be somewhat more marked for the L4 group than for the S4 group. The following is a summary of the significant and near-significant inter-group directional differences on the individual items of question three: The L4 group saw Drink beer or liquor in public, Play cards for money, Try to help solve quarrels between children and parents, and Bet money at a race track as more proper than did the L1 group. The L1 group saw Work to promote the campaign of a political candidate as more proper than did the S1

group, but it was vice versa for Try to help solve quarrels between children and parents. The S4 group saw Play cards for money, Try to help solve quarrels between children and parents, and Bet money at a race track as more proper than did the I1 group, but it was vice versa for Participate in group dancing and Wear non-clerical clothes in public. The I4 group saw the following activities as more proper than did the S1 group: Bet money at a race track, Drink beer or liquor in public, and Smoke in public; vice versa was the case between the two groups for Lead a fund raising drive for charity. The I4 group tended to see Participate in group dancing and Wear non-clerical clothes in public as more proper than did the S4 group. And the S4 group saw the following activities as being more proper than did the S1 group: Play cards for money, Work to promote the campaign of a political candidate, Bet money at a race track, and Drink beer or liquor in public; vice versa was the case between the two groups for Participate in group dancing. The following items showed no inter-group differences: Administer the sacraments, Golf in public, Help husbands and wives solve marital problems, Say Mass, Swim at a public beach, and Teach in school.

The results from question four show a very clear tendency for the S4 group to see the priest as more understanding than do all three other groups. This tendency exists to a less marked degree in the S1 group when it is compared to the I1 group. The following is a summary of the significant and near significant inter-group directional differences on the individual items of question four: The I4 group rates the priest as more understanding than did the I1 group on the following items: Habit of losing one's temper and doing wrong things out of anger, and Hardships parents have in raising their children; vice versa was the case between the two groups for Habit of coming late to Sunday Mass. The S1

group rated the priest as more understanding than did the I1 group on Disagreement or conflict with one's parents, Habit of losing one's temper and doing wrong things out of anger, and Inability to get along with one's spouse. The S4 group rated the priest as more understanding than did the I1 group on Trouble accepting some teaching of the Church, Habit of losing one's temper and doing wrong things out of anger, Difficulty with money—financial problems, Anger toward a priest for something he said or did, Hardships parents have in raising their children, and Inability to get along with one's spouse. The S1 group rated the priest as more understanding than did the I4 group on Disagreement or conflict with one's parents. The S4 group rated the priest as more understanding than did the I4 group on Trouble accepting some teaching of the Church, Difficulty with money—financial problems, difficulty doing well in school or academic work, Disagreement or conflict with one's parents, and Inability to get along with one's spouse. The S4 group rated the priest as more understanding than did the S1 group on Trouble accepting some teaching of the Church, Constantly using vulgar or indecent language, Anger toward a priest for something he said or did, Hardships parents have in raising their children, and Inability to get along with one's spouse. Finally, the following items showed no inter-group differences whatsoever: Trouble getting to Mass on Sundays, Improper sex desires, Trouble living up to the fasting regulations of the Church, Failure to give enough money to the Church, and Being afraid about going to confession.

For the problems listed in question five, the I4 group selected the priest as best able to help significantly less often than did all three other groups. There were no other noteworthy inter-group differences for the question as a

whole. The following is a summary of all the significant and near significant inter-group directional differences on individual items: The L4 group selected the priest less often than all three of the other groups on the following items: A student is having trouble getting his schoolwork well enough, A person has sexual wants which he does not want or cannot control, and Parents are having trouble getting their children to obey them properly. In addition the L4 group selected the priest less often than both freshman groups for A husband and wife cannot get along sexually with each other; and the L4 group selected the priest less often than both seminarian groups for A person has great difficulty controlling his temper, and than the S1 group for A person believes he is God or the Messiah. The L1 group tended to select the priest more often than did the S1 group for A person wants to talk something over in private etc.; and it was vice versa between the groups for A person has great difficulty controlling his temper. The L1 group selected the priest more often than did the S4 group for A young person wants to decide what occupation to choose, and A husband and wife cannot get along sexually with each other; but the S4 group tended to select the priest more often for A person has great difficulty controlling his temper. Finally, the S1 group selected the priest more often than the S4 group for A husband and wife can't get along sexually with each other, but it was vice versa for Parents are having trouble getting their children to obey them properly. The following items showed no inter-group differences whatsoever: A person has financial or money problems, A husband and wife constantly disagree etc., A person constantly sees or hears things that don't really exist, A parent wants to get his child over a great fear of going to school, A person wants to get over an abnormal fear of certain things, A person is afraid to go to confession, A

person wants help for something and doesn't know who else to see, and A person feels like everything he does is a sin.

On question six as a whole the only directional inter-group differences showed the L4 group rating the activities listed as less satisfying for the priest than did all three other groups. The following is a summary of all the directional inter-group differences on the individual items of question six: The L1 group tended to see Handling Parish social events as more satisfying for the priest than did the L4 group. The S1 group saw Saying his office or breviary prayers, and Presiding at funerals as more satisfying than did the L1 group; vice versa was found between the two groups for Handling Parish social events. The L1 group rated the following activities as more satisfying than did the S4 group: Baptizing children, Raising money for the Church, Handling Parish social events, and Giving Communions; the S4 group saw the following activities as more satisfying than did the L1 group: Visiting the dying, Hearing confessions, and Counseling parishioners. The S1 group saw the following activities as more satisfying than did the L4 group: Visiting the sick, Saying his office or breviary prayers, Visiting the dying, and Presiding at funerals; the L4 group saw Handling Parish social events as more satisfying than did the S1 group. The S4 group rated the following activities as more satisfying than did the L4 group: Visiting the sick, Visiting the dying, Counseling parishioners, and Hearing confessions; the L4 group saw the following activities as more satisfying than did the S4 group: Baptizing children, Handling Parish social events, and Giving Communions. Finally, the S1 group saw the following activities as more satisfying than did the S4 group: Baptizing children, Giving Communions, and Raising money for the Church; the S4 group saw Counseling

parishioners as more satisfying than did the S1 group, on the other hand. The following items on question six showed no inter-group difference whatsoever: Giving sermons, Teaching school, Giving instructions to convert and inquiry classes, Saying Mass, Presiding at Weddings, and Running the Parish business affairs.

Summary By Vocation, Age and Subject Groups

In a way this study has been interested in the effects of two dimensions on the attitudes of adolescent boys about the priesthood, namely, (1) the existence of a priestly vocation and (2) age with all that it means in terms of experiences, growth, and so forth. Each of the four subject groups is different from every other group in either vocation, age or both; and this provides a basis for considering the effects of these two dimensions, including some of their interrelationships. An attempt will be made to assess the general results obtained in the six areas of inquiry of this study considered from the viewpoint of vocational and age level influences. In so doing, attention will be paid primarily to the general difference patterns which occurred between groups on the questions; and exceptions to such general patterns, though several exist, will not be considered as such.

The similarity seen between the priesthood and other occupations appears to be influenced primarily by the vocational dimension. Thus the seminarian groups saw less similarity as a rule than did their lay peers. At the same time, the age factor does enter in, serving to accentuate the vocational differences. Hence the S4 group saw by far the least similarity, and the L4 group tended to see the most.

The desirability for priests to have good qualities again appears to be

influenced primarily by vocational choice, with both seminarian groups seeing greater desirability than their lay peers. However, there is also a definite age factor which involves the older adolescents tending to see greater desirability for the priest to have good qualities. Hence both senior groups saw greater desirability than their respective freshman groups.

For behavior which all the groups agreed was sometimes or seldom proper, there was a general tendency for the older adolescent subjects to see the impropriety as less severe in degree than did the younger subjects. Thus age differences had the greatest influence on the adolescent boys' assessments about the propriety of various kinds of behavior for a priest; but there was also a mild vocationally caused difference, namely, the seminarians had a tendency to see sometimes or seldom proper behavior as slightly less proper in degree than the lay subjects saw it.

The vocational dimension was the primary basis for differences found in the subjects' ratings about how well the priest can understand the problems of lay persons. Thus the lay subjects saw the priest as less understanding; and this difference increased with age, the oldest subject groups showing the greatest disparity.

How much the priest was seen as best able to help with various personal problems showed primarily a vocational difference that did not appear except with age. Thus the IJ group considered the priest best able to help less often than all the other groups.

The same was true for how much satisfaction the subjects saw the priest as getting from his various functions. The IJ group rated the priest as getting less satisfaction than did all the other groups.

These findings show that the S4 group stood out as having the strongest and clearest ideas about the priesthood. Thus they saw other occupations as less similar, yet appeared to have the strongest ideas about which occupations had greater or lesser relative similarity. They showed the strongest conviction that it is desirable for priests to have as many good qualities as possible, and had the greatest number of disagreements with the other groups concerning the degree of satisfaction the priest derives from various priestly functions.

The L4 group also stood out, on the other hand, as not tending to idealize the priest so much as did all the other groups. Thus they saw the priest as more similar to other occupations; and they viewed the priest as less understanding, as less often the best able to help with personal problems, and as getting less satisfaction from his priestly activities.

At the same time, the L4 group tended to go along with its seminarian peer group in seeing desirable qualities as important for priests to have--though not so strongly--and in seeing sometimes or seldom proper activities by the priest as not being improper to the degree that the other groups felt they were.

In addition to the above differences between themselves and the fourth year groups, both freshmen groups tended to show the same differences between themselves that were found between the senior groups, though always to a less marked degree. However, the L1 group tended to idealize the priest more than did the L4 group; so the L1 group didn't differ from the seminarians concerning the priest's ability to help and the degree of pleasure derived from performing various priestly functions.

Significance of Results for Hypotheses

All of the hypotheses of this study have been supported by the results obtained. Thus the main hypothesis has been affirmed: There clearly are differences of opinion about the priesthood among the groups studied—seminarian and non-seminarian Catholic boys at the secondary school level. The secondary hypotheses concerning the existence of age and vocational differences among the groups have also been supported by the results. Finally, the two secondary hypotheses concerning the results obtained from using both the rating and ranking approaches on questions one and two also appear to be fully supported by the results. First, the two approaches did result in different patterns of subject-group differences for the various items in each question. And secondly the rating results did provide more complete and meaningful information about the opinions of the groups while demonstrating that they can provide very similar results about each group's relative rankings of all the items in each question.

Relationship of Results to Previous Studies

Only questions one and two have any direct content relationship to any of the previous studies reviewed in chapter two. Question one is very similar in form to the first question reported by the four Belgian nuns (1957; see chapter two of this dissertation, pp. 30-31) and also used by the Chicago study (Herr, to be published; see pp. 44-45 of this dissertation). Those studies used only six professions, however, whereas there were fourteen used in question one of this dissertation. Yet by using the rating data of this study it is possible to consider the six categories used in common with the Belgian and Loyola studies and to ignore the additional eight categories used in this study. In this

way the relative ranks for the similarity of those occupations listed by all three studies can be compared to determine the degree of agreement among the three samples about which of said occupations are more or less similar to the priesthood.

Only one of the occupations used in the Belgian and Loyola studies was not duplicated here, namely, that of director. The closest one used, which it was thought would be more meaningful to the subjects used in this study, was that of manager; so manager and director will be considered as rough equivalents in comparing the present study with the previous two. According to table 6, the Belgian girls as a whole ranked the six professions in the following order when asked to select which occupations were most like the priesthood: doctor, professor, soldier, judge, director and lawyer. Herr reports that the Chicago girls ranked the occupations in the following order: doctor, professor; then judge and director without specifying the order; then soldier and lawyer tied for the fifth and sixth ranks. Deriving the relative ranks of the current study from the proportion scores (see table 27, pp. 107-108 of this dissertation), the midwestern United States boys ranked the similarity of the six occupations in the following order: doctor, professor, soldier, manager, judge, and lawyer (see also p. 173). To determine statistically how much relationship exists between these three sets of ranks, rank correlations were computed between them based on the formula given by Garrett (1947, p. 345). The rho was .94 between the current study's results and the results for the Belgian girls, and .74 between the current study's results (with midwestern United States adolescent boys) and those of the Loyola study (with Chicago adolescent girls). The results for Belgian girls also correlated .74 with those from the Loyola

study. The rho of .94 is significant at the one per cent level of confidence when there are four degrees of freedom, whereas the rho's of .74 only approach significance, their probability being .10 based on a derived t value of 2.21 with four degrees of freedom (See Garrett, 1947, pp.290-299). These figures show that the results for question one of the present study are definitely in agreement with those of the comparable question in the Belgian study. And that the subjects of all three studies have at least a tendency to rank the above six occupations in the same order regarding their similarity to the priesthood.

The results of question one also have passing pertinence to Schuyler's findings (1960, p. 175) with New York city parishioners (see table 17, p. 53 of this dissertation). Thus Schuyler's sample ranked the parish priest's role of counselor as being the second most important of eleven roles listed, and the subjects of the present study unanimously rated counselor as the most similar to the priesthood of fourteen occupations listed. These findings suggest that lay Catholics attach a great deal of importance to the priest's secondary role of counselor, and would tend to lend support to the idea that clergymen can play important direct as well as indirect roles in influencing the mental health of their parishioners. The results of question one also have some passing significance in relation to Iyota's study (1948) of the interests of seminarians. Iyota found that the interests of priests and seminarians correlated highly with those of social science teachers and city school superintendents; moderately highly with those of math-science teachers, office managers, and insurance salesman; and lowest with those of engineers (see pp. 56-57 of this dissertation). The subjects in the present study rated engineer as the least similar to the priesthood of the fourteen occupations listed. Teacher was

rated second highest whereas scientist was rated second lowest, which might be seen as related to the fact that the interests of math-science teachers correlated in the moderate range and showed the lowest correlation of all teacher-related occupations in Iyota's study. Salesman and manager were rated in the middle range of similarity in the present study. Hence this rough comparison with the results of Iyota's study raises the interesting possibility that occupational groups with similar interests to priests tend to be seen as similar by adolescent male subjects.

Question two is very similar in form to the fifth question reported by the four Belgian nuns (see pp. 34-36 of this dissertation) and repeated by the Loyola study (see p. 46 of this dissertation). The Belgian adolescent girls ranked the comparative desirability of the ten qualities listed in the following order: understanding, sincerity, will power, Hope in God, humility, intelligence, zeal, respect for people, abnegation regarding comfort, and politeness. The Chicago adolescent girls ranked these qualities in the following order of desirability: understanding, sincerity, humility and Hope in God; then will power, intelligence and politeness without any order among them indicated (all were therefore given a rank of six); then respect for people and abnegation regarding comfort in a tie for the eighth and ninth ranks; and zeal was last. All ten of these qualities were among the seventeen listed in question two of the present study. And the midwestern United States adolescent boys rated these ten qualities in the following order (based on the proportion scores for each quality obtained from question two): Hope in God, understanding, sincerity, zeal, will power, humility, respect for people, ability to give up comfort, intelligence, and politeness. To determine the extent of similarity in results

obtained for these ten qualities by the three studies, rank correlations were computed (Garrett, 1947, p. 345). A rho of .78 was obtained between the Belgian study's results and those of the present study, significant at the one per cent level of confidence with eight degrees of freedom (Garrett, 1947, p. 299). The rho for the same comparison with the Loyola study's Chicago results was .69, significant at the five per cent level of confidence. And the rho for the Belgian results compared with Chicago results was .77, significant at the one per cent level of confidence. These findings suggest that when it comes to the relative order of preference concerning the desirability for priests to have the above ten qualities, Belgian adolescent girls, Chicago adolescent girls and midwestern United States adolescent boys all agree to a significant extent.

It should be emphasized that while the results from questions one and two of the present study are similar to those obtained from the comparable parts of the Belgian and Loyola studies, this is true only on a ranking basis. That is, the samples from the three studies tend to agree in their relative preferences about the factors studied. There is no way of determining for certain whether any differences of opinion exist between the samples such as were found from the rating approach used in the present study. It would be inaccurate, therefore, to say that no differences of opinion exist among the samples, or even to say without qualification that their opinions are similar.

There is some relationship between question two of the present study, and the second and third questions reported by Rabin (1953) (see pp. 16-17 of this dissertation). However, the qualities Rabin reports from his essay questions are not easily comparable to the qualities listed in question two, nor was the form of either of his questions clearly comparable to the task set by question

two, namely, to indicate how desirable the subjects considered it for the priest to have certain qualities. Accordingly, they are not similar enough to warrant an elaborate comparison. A comment can be made about one finding of this study which may have some pertinence to the issues about the "incarnation value" discussed by Habin, however (see pp. 17-19 of this dissertation). When the subjects in the present study were asked to indicate how desirable it was for priests to have various qualities, they unanimously and clearly rated (and ranked) a theological or spiritual quality highest of all seventeen given (Hope in God), whereas all of the qualities listed which might be associated with the "incarnation value" were rated lower in desirability (such as respect for people, cheerfulness, patience with others, politeness, and understanding). Perhaps this is due to a genuine difference in the opinions of the subjects used in this study and those used in the studies reported by Habin, the four Belgian nuns, and Horr; this is because Hope in God was not ranked ahead of some of those other qualities by the Belgian and Chicago adolescent girls. Further investigation would be necessary before any definitive statements about this issue appear warranted, however.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study has been to investigate opinions about the Catholic priesthood in Catholic high school boys and comparable minor seminarians. To this end a paper and pencil questionnaire was constructed based partially on earlier studies and also on the development of new approaches from ideas inspired by familiarization with materials and activities of the Religion and Mental Health project at Loyola University.

The questionnaire was designed to tap six general areas of opinion through the use of six general questions each of which has fourteen or more specific parts or items. It was administered to first and fourth year students from a high school for Catholic boys and a diocesan minor seminary in a large midwestern metropolitan area. The groups at each school year level were found to be the same age, and primarily a midwestern United States sample of Catholic boys mostly from the metropolitan area where the schools are located. All the subjects who reported their religion were Catholic and had at least one Catholic parent, and most reported both parents as Catholic. A variety of parental occupations was reported with a tendency for the high school or lay subjects to have relatively more fathers with professional, technical and kindred occupations, whereas the seminarians had relatively more fathers who were craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers. Most of the subjects had received all of their education in Catholic schools. The groups were compared with respect to the

number of their known near relatives who have studied to be priests or religious and no serious differences seemed apparent. Relatively more members of the L₁ group reported having at least one serious disagreement with a priest.

The four subject groups were compared for their responses to each item and appropriate groupings thereof through the use of the Chi^2 test (or the Fisher test of exact probability when cell frequencies were too low for the Chi^2 method). In addition rank correlations were done to compare the relative importance of the groups attached to the items on some questions.

The results are reported in detail in chapter six, and are summarized and compared to earlier related studies in chapter seven. Several general trends were found in addition to the specific item differences. An important general impression is that the degree of agreement among the groups was quite high for all six areas investigated. So, while several definite and meaningful differences were found, it should be kept in mind that these are differences among groups who appear to be greatly alike in their general opinions about the Catholic priesthood.

The first general difference found was that seminarians tend to see other occupations as less similar to the priesthood than do their high school peers. This tendency was more marked in the older groups, the S₁ group seeing definitely the least similarity and the L₁ group tending to see the most. When the groups were asked to rate how desirable they thought it would be for the priest to have each of seventeen good qualities, there was a general tendency for the seminarians to see a greater degree of desirability than their respective lay peers. On this question the older subjects (L₁ and S₁ groups) saw greater desirability than did their respective first year groups.

When the groups were asked to rate how proper it is for a priest to engage in each of fifteen different activities, there was as usual considerable agreement. There were almost no inter-group differences found among the activities seen as proper or very proper. But for activities which all the groups agreed were sometimes or seldom proper, the younger subjects tended to see a greater degree of impropriety than did the older groups; secondarily there was also a mild tendency for each seminarian group to see a greater degree of impropriety than did their high school peers.

Two questions dealt with the priest's role as counselor. In the first the subjects were asked to rate how well they expected the average priest to understand fifteen problems which the average lay Catholic might have. In the second, sixteen problems were listed for which a person might seek outside help and the subjects were asked which of three helping persons would be best able to help: the counseling psychologist, priest or minister, or psychiatrist. The fourth year seminarians saw the priest as more understanding than did all three other groups, and the first year seminarians saw the priest as more understanding than did the high school freshmen. The high school seniors saw the priest as best able to help less often than all three other groups, which showed no other differences among themselves. Of interest was the large number of problems for which the priest was seen as best able to help by all the groups.

The last question asked the subjects to estimate how much satisfaction or enjoyment they thought the average priest would get from sixteen different functions common to priests. The only general trend found was that the high school seniors rated the priest as getting less satisfaction than did all three other groups.

A secondary purpose developed for this dissertation during the construction of the questionnaire. Many questionnaire studies in the psychology and sociology of religion have utilized the ranking approach to the construction of items. While the form of ranking questions was considered desirable, especially because it enables a subject to give a large number of responses in a short period of time, the ranking approach was considered very undesirable for the purpose of comparing group opinions. This is because responses to each item of a ranking question are entirely relative to the responses on every other item. To eliminate the shortcomings this would cause, the rating approach used in this study was adopted; and it was decided to compare it directly with the ranking method on questions one and two. The ranking approach to questions one and two, called questions 1R and 2R, was found to yield different patterns of inter-group differences on individual items than did the rating approach. And it was thought that the rating approach provided valuable information that could not be obtained from the ranking approach, most notably the general trends showing inter-group differences on questions one and two when each was taken as a whole. At the same time it was shown that each subject group's relative preferences for the items on questions one and two could be determined from the rating approach as well as from the ranking approach, hence there does not appear to be any information of value obtained from the ranking approach that cannot be derived from the rating approach.

The summary of the results in chapter seven was accompanied by a discussion of their relationship to findings of previous studies. Generally, the results appear to be consistent with those of previous studies, though there were only a few instances in which comparisons appeared indicated.

Another secondary purpose of this study was to provide stimulation for further research. Several ideas for further work can be suggested. Thus, it would be interesting to compare other groups for their responses to the questions developed. For example, how would adolescent subjects tend to respond to questions about how well certain of their problems are understood by parents, priests and other adult figures? How would older subjects, priests, psychologists and psychiatrists answer the items about whether a priest, psychiatrist or psychologist was best able to help with various problems for which people might seek outside help? How would older subjects answer the question about the propriety for the priest to engage in various behaviors such as given in question three? In another vein, how would Protestant and Jewish subjects answer these same questions as applied to their clergymen? And in still another vein, would the responses of successful and unsuccessful seminarian candidates for the priestly vocation show differences on questions such as given in this questionnaire? If this dissertation plays a role in stimulating further research along these or any other lines, it will achieve one of its most important purposes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anonymous (Four Belgian Nuns) "Opinions and attitudes of adolescent girls towards the priest." Lumen Vitae (Engl. Ed.), XII, No. 2, 1957, 342-352.
- Babin, P. "What youth thinks of priests and the religious life." Lumen Vitae (Engl. Ed.), VIII, No. 4, 1953, 639-653.
- Bier, W. C. "A comparative study of a seminary group and four other groups on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory." Stud. Psychol. & Psychiat., Cath. Univ. Amer., 1948, 7, xi.
- Clark, W. H. The Psychology of Religion, Macmillan Co., New York, 1958.
- Fichter, J. H. Southern Parish, Volume I: Dynamics of a City Church, Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, 1951.
- Social Relations in the Urban Parish, Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, 1954.
- Parochial School. A Sociological Study, Univ. Notre Dame Press, 1958.
- Religion as an Occupation, Univ. Notre Dame Press, 1961.
- Garrett, H. E. Statistics in Psychology and Education, Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1947.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, McGraw-Hill Co., New York, 1950.
- Herberg, W. Protestant-Catholic-Jew, Doubleday and Co., New York, 1955.
- Herr, V. V.; Devlin, W. J.; and Kobler, F. J. Religion and Mental Health. Academy of Religion and Mental Health, New York, 1960.
- Herr, V. V. "Mental health training in Catholic seminaries." J. Religion and Health, 1962, 127-152.
- The Psychology of Religion. To be published.
- Kobler, F. J.; Webb, N. J.; Herr, V. V.; and Devlin, W. J. "Loyola University NIMH Project on Religion and Mental Health." Pastoral Psychol., Feb., 1959.

- Kelley, G. A. Catholics and the Practice of the Faith, Cath. Univ. Amer. Press, Wash. D. C., 1946.
- Kupky, O. The Religious Development of Adolescents. (Transl. by W. C. Frow), Macmillan Co., New York, 1928.
- Lhota, B. "Vocational interests of Catholic priests." Stud. Psychol. & Psychiat., Cath. Univ. Amer., 1948, 7, vii.
- Murray, J. B. "Personality study of priests and seminarians." The Homiletic and Pastoral Review, LIX, 1959, 443-447.
- Nuesse, C. J. The Social Thought of American Catholics, 1634-1829, Cath. Univ. Amer. Press, Wash. D. C., 1945.
- Pfliegler, M. Priestly Existence (Transl. by F. P. Dinneen), Newman Press, Westminster, Md., 1957.
- Schuyler, J. B. Northern Parish, Loyola Univ. Press, Chicago, 1960.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics, McGraw-Hill Co., New York, 1956.
- Smith, M. S. "Parish clergymen's role images as pastoral counselors." J. Pastoral Care, 1960, 14, 21-28.
- Suhard, E. Cardinal. Growth or Decline? The Church Today (Transl. by J. A. Corbett), Fides Publ., So. Bend, 1948.
- Priests Among Men, Integrity Publ., New York, 1950.
- Young, K. Sociology, American Book Co., New York, 1942.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by David DeSales Markert has been read and approved by five members of the Department of Psychology.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

May 28, 1963
Date

Vincent V. Herzog
Signature of Adviser